School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1419692

PHILISTINES & HEBREWS

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

EBA

PHILISTINES AND HEBREWS

DS
121
K35

PHILISTINES AND HEBREWS

AN ESSAY ON THE BIBLICAL NARRATIVES

BY

A PHILISTINE

Kennard, Henry Martyn

FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION

LONDON: CHAPMAN & HALL, LD.
1892.

H+L+
ano. 5th LC+

WESTMINSTER :
PRINTED BY NICHOLS AND SONS,
25, PARLIAMENT STREET.

Private and Confidential.

63, Lowndes Square, S.W.

Dear Sir,

In offering you my little work on the Philistines and Hebrews, I must explain that the object I have in publishing it for private circulation is a tentative one.

Fully realising the import of my theory, I hesitate to place it before the public before receiving a sanction from scholars.

Waiting your approval,

I beg to remain,

Yours truly,

H. MARTYN KENNARD.

School of Theology

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/philistineshebre0000kenn

PREFACE.

In order that the reader may follow the line of argument I have ventured to adopt in the following treatise I will briefly state the object I have had in view.

I must submit that the Biblical narratives were compiled for the purpose of giving a Divine origin to a priestly cult; they are based on authentic records, but distorted in order to support the priestly design.

It has been ascertained that a race known as the Hyksos, or Shepherds, held dominion in Egypt for some five centuries, when they were forced to retreat from their capital, Thebes, under their King Aphosis, during the 16th century B.C., by the Pharaoh

Aahmes, who founded the 18th Egyptian Dynasty.

They, however, continued to hold the Delta of Egypt for forty years, when they were expelled by Thotmes III. about 1500 B.C., and retreating to Palestine, conquered and occupied the country, which was at that period in the possession of the Israelites.

The authentic records of this retreat and conquest, I maintain, are to be found in the Book of Joshua, but the narratives have been garbled to make it appear that the retreat of the Hyksos, and their conquest of Palestine, applied to a retreat and conquest by some Hebrew slaves, who are exhibited to us as a race under the peculiar protection of the Almighty; the priestly historians adroitly associating them with the Israelites, insensibly lead us to believe that the Hebrews by Divine assistance became the possessors of their promised land, which certainly was never realised, for we gather

from the records that the Hebrew slaves expelled from Egypt amid portentous signs and wonders under the personal guidance of their God purposely avoided Judea for fear of the Hyksos Philistines, and entered the province of Israel "through the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea;" thus it becomes apparent that the Philistines were in possession of Judea before the retreat of the Hebrews; and as these Philistines were never dislodged, the Hebrews could not have secured supremacy in Judea, which is clearly designated by the historians as their promised land.

Exodus xiii. 17.

We have further learned that the Hyksos retreated from Egypt and occupied Palestine about 1500 B.C., and were known as Philistines, giving their name to the country; and when we gather from the Biblical records that the people occupying Judea (undoubtedly the Jews) built their temple in Jerusalem in 1017 B.C., four hundred and eighty years

I. Kings vi. 1.

after their retreat from Egypt, we can date the retreat of the Jews from Egypt to about 1500 B.C., which corresponds with the date of the retreat of the Hyksos under their king, Aphosis; and as Moses is said to be the leader of the Jewish retreat from Egypt, we are forced to the conclusion that Moses and Aphosis are identical personages, and that the Jews were the people known as the Philistines and Hyksos.

This would appear to be confirmed by our finding the code of laws drawn up by Moses (*i.e.* Aphosis) and followed by the Jews, is almost identical with the Egyptian code; and as we know that the Hyksos were worshippers of Amen-ra, we can only conclude that the temple in Jerusalem was dedicated to that God. Although Solomon was the actual builder, yet we know it was designed and founded by his father David, and as we learn that Hirhor at this period was the Pharaoh of Egypt, and bore the

name of Nsbindidi, a word compounded with the name Didi or David, and meaning the follower of the ram, the symbol of Amen-ra (represented by the horns on the altar), we certainly have some grounds for conjecturing not only that David dedicated his temple to Amen-ra, but that David and Hirhor are one and the same king, both having acquired their right to the throne through Aphosis (*i.e.* Moses), both being lords over the Western Empire.

I shall also venture to point out that David and the succeeding kings of Judea (not Judah) were the lineal descendants of Mose (*i.e.* Aphosis), the Hyksos Pharaoh of the 17th Egyptian Dynasty, and alone depended on their Hyksos, Philistine, or Cherethite troops in defending their position; and as I must submit that the Hyksos, after their retreat from Egypt and conquest of Palestine, were known as Philistines, and were also called Jews

owing to their territorial possession of Judea, it becomes evident we should find two distinct families of Jews in Judea, viz. the Hyksos conquerors and the subjugated Israelites of the tribe of Judah.

The priestly historians have taken advantage of this, and have ingeniously led us to believe that the Hebrews, their chosen people, were identical with the Hyksos Jews, and consequently were in possession of their promised land. Upon them is based the priestly claim of Divine right to imperial power and universal dominion; I must however maintain that the Hyksos Philistine Jews occupied this country, and were never dislodged, and as we are distinctly led to understand that these Philistines could claim no special protection from the Almighty, the priestly plot becomes exposed.

Whether I have been able to establish this position I must leave to the judgment of the intelligent reader.

PHILISTINES & HEBREWS.

An Essay on the Biblical Narratives.

CHAPTER I.

Errors to be dangerous must have a great deal of truth mingled with them; it is only from this alliance that they can ever obtain an extensive circulation: from pure extravagance, and genuine, unmingled falsehood, the world never has and never can sustain any mischief.

Sydney Smith.

I MUST presume my readers have a general acquaintance with the Biblical writings.

The Jews, the Israelites, and the Hebrews have been stamped on our thoughts from earliest infancy, so any new light thrown on their history will be interesting to many.

I do not profess any pretensions to Biblical scholarship, nor do I claim any literary merit or ambition; by chance only I stumbled on a theory which some con-

siderable research convinced me was tenable.

My aim is to demonstrate this problem, not to develop history. So I shall be as brief and concise as possible ; with the one hope, it may attract the attention of students, in whose hands I shall gratefully leave it for further elucidation.

Ernest Renan, History of the People of Israel, Preface, xi.

M. Renan tersely tells us it has never been established by observation that a superior being troubles himself, for a moral or an immoral purpose, with the things of nature or the affairs of mankind. I need not point out that such a conception shatters the very foundation stone of the Biblical narratives. If M. Renan's view is correct, we may dismiss from our minds all supernatural agencies as factors in the guidance of mankind and follow the dictates of reason in our historical research.

I approach my subject with profound diffidence, for my views will clash with those of our greatest scholars. I can only hope my very startling conjectures may receive fair consideration.

Professor Sayce in his very interesting

little work on "A Forgotten Empire" gives us a map illustrating the extent of that ancient empire. It covers a country from the Euxine in the north to Egypt in the south, from the Tigris in the east to the Mediterranean in the west.

Although this Hittite Empire probably existed in remote times, I venture to suggest that it cannot be the Hittite Empire of the Old Testament. Biblical historians apparently knew nothing of it; it had become lost to view in a greater Hittite Empire. I would further venture to conjecture that a conquering host invaded this country from the far east in very early times, and a race known as Chaldeans became dominant, and extended their conquests to include Egypt as far south as Syene, and became split up into various quasi independent monarchies when a strong arm failed to keep them together; the various races occupying the soil before their arrival became subject to them. A section of this Chaldean host conquered and occupied the Hittite country and became known as Hittites, as occupiers of the old

Hittite Empire; thus we should have the subjugated Hittites and the Hittite conquerors on the scene.

Monuments and hieroglyphics clearly point this out, and Mr. Sayce tells us that the ancient Hittites were of a totally different race from the Phœnician Kheta (or Hittites) of the Old Testament.

The Hittites, page 15.

The Biblical narratives, although distorted by priestcraft, are undoubtedly based on more or less authentic records, and if we follow them by the light of reason we can trace true history.

It will not be questioned that the Chaldeans exercised a supreme influence in very early times; they had subjugated the people of Shumir and Accad and all the then existing tribes in that region, and Abraham looms on the horizon as a great emperor; and if we follow the Koran he was a contemporary of Nimrod, so we might regard them as the heads of two great conflicting races.

In the Biblical narratives we are told Abraham migrated from Ur of Chaldea and settled in Palestine; we find him alluded

to as a mighty prince. A muffled clash of kings is recorded, where Abraham came out victorious. Still advancing south he occupies Egypt, and here I must hazard a bold conjecture. I imagine Abraham's first visit to Egypt typifies the occupation of the country by the Hyksos, or Shepherd Kings.

Genesis xxiii. 6.

xii. 11.

If the reader will glance over the fourteenth chapter of Genesis, it will be noticed that the records very pointedly shadow a general upheaval of nations, extending over many years. It is probably the same revolution referred to in the Koran under a poetical disguise, thus we might reasonably conjecture a change of dynasty occurred in Egypt at this period.

Genesis xiv.

Koran Sur. xxxvii.

We know the Hyksos did occupy Egypt in remote times; and if Abraham's first visit to Egypt does not typify this event, why have we no record of such a momentous revolution? Why have we been kept in the dark concerning the five centuries of Hyksos rule in Egypt? The answer is easy. It did not suit the design of the priestly historians, whose apparent object was to make it appear that the isolated family of Jacob

were the only chosen people of the Almighty, and heirs to a supposed Divine promise of universal dominion made to Abraham.

We must now pass over the rule of the Shepherd Kings, and suppose that five centuries elapse from the date of Abraham's entry into Egypt; and we find it recorded: "And Pharaoh commanded his men concerning him [Abraham]: and they sent him away, and his wife, and all that he had."

Genesis xii. 20.

This I must contend typifies the retreat of the Hyksos Chaldean family from Egypt under an honourable convention. To account for such a revolution we can only suppose that the Hyksos were expelled by another more powerful family. And if we closely follow the Biblical narratives we may dimly trace this family.

Bunsen's Egypt, vol. i. 193.

It will be remembered Abraham is said to have had two sons, Ishmael and Isaac. I must presume it will be admitted that individual names in Biblical history represent races. Abraham typifies a powerful Chaldean family; his sons, powerful races radiating from him. Both for brevity and clearness such historical genealogies may

Chaldea, Z. A. Ragozin, 131.

be very convenient, but we are apt to take a too contracted view of events, unless this principle of developing history is distinctly kept in view.

A very superficial glance over the eleventh and following chapters of Genesis will convince us that a mighty revolution is indicated; a great confederacy of nations from the far east would appear to have swept westward, and were opposed by the great Emperor Abraham, who appears to have held his own, for it is recorded: "In the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates:" which is a figurative method of expressing that the race of Abraham became lords of a vast empire by conquest. As the Biblical narratives lead us to suppose Abraham was a simple wanderer, travelling about with his wife and nephew, I refer the reader to George Rawlinson's observations on the Eastern powers. These powers are also shadowed in Genesis: "And it came to pass in the days of Amraphel king of Shinar, Arioch

Genesis xv. 18.

Five Great Monarchies, George Rawlinson, vol. i. chap. viii.

Genesis xiv.

king of Ellasar, Chedorlaomer king of Elam, and Tidal king of nations; that these made war with Bera king of Sodom, and with Birsha king of Gomorrah, Shinab king of Admah, and Shemeber king of Zeboiim, and the king of Bela, which is Zoar. All these were joined together in the vale of Siddim. Twelve years they served Chedorlaomer, and in the thirteenth year they rebelled." From which we may gather that Chedorlaomer, the Kudur-Lagamer of the inscriptions, was a mighty monarch, and reigned over a vast empire.

See Z. A. Ragozin, Chaldea, chap. iv.

The following narrative, therefore, is repugnant to reason :—

Genesis xiv. 14.

"And when Abram heard that his brother was taken captive, he armed his trained servants, born in his own house, three hundred and eighteen, and pursued them unto Dan. And he divided himself against them, he and his servants, by night, and smote them, and pursued them to Hobah, which is on the left hand of Damascus. And he brought back all the goods, and also brought again his brother Lot, and his goods, and the women also, and the people."

These events are probably based upon authentic records, but they have been clearly twisted and garbled to further the aims of priestcraft. Abraham, beyond a doubt, was not a wandering shepherd, but the chief of a powerful and conquering race.

It is very remarkable that although we are aware the influence of Egypt was so decided, not once in the Biblical records is there any allusion to their central symbols of worship. The names of their great Triad never appear, and yet we know the Osirian cult exercised profound influence; and we learn from an inscription only lately discovered that the worship of Osiris, Horus, Isis, and Bast flourished in Palestine down to the third century B.C.

Palestine Exploration, Quarterly Statement, April, 1892, p. 173.

Again, although we find the Kheta occupied Palestine during the 18th and 19th Egyptian Dynasties, and that Set or Sutekh was their chief deity, not once is there any allusion to their names. This is very significant, and must force us to the conclusion that it did not suit the design of the priestly historians to refer to them.

Brugsch's Egypt, vol. i. 269.

We may be certain, however, that the

Hebrew cult was evolved from the great Osirian system, and for this reason its origin has been obscured.

We might easily conjecture that Abraham was the centre of a vast priestly system; his race was conceived to be under the special protection of the Almighty. It is recorded Abraham had two sons, Ishmael and Isaac, and in the course of centuries these two families came into conflict with each other and separated. This separation is clearly defined in the Biblical writings, and might indicate a war of succession. The race of Ishmael retire to Arabia, where they formed an empire, and have ever since claimed to be the eldest representatives of Father Abraham and the true heirs to the Divine promise. The family of Isaac remained in the northern country, and adopted a special cult. Hagar, the mother of Ishmael, the Egyptian princess of the Koran, is degraded into the bond-woman of the Bible, and the son of Sarah claims to be the legitimate heir to the promise. That is the Empire.

A friendly compromise is indicated in

symbolical language: "And Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, which she had borne unto Abraham, mocking. Wherefore she said unto Abraham, Cast out this bondwoman and her son, for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac. And the thing was very grievous in Abraham's sight because of his son. And God said to Abraham, Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad, and because of thy bondwoman; in all that Sarah has said unto thee, hearken unto her voice; for in Isaac shall thy seed be called. And also of the son of thy bondwoman will I make a nation, because he is thy seed." *Genesis xxi. 9.*

So Ishmael retired south; and he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran; and his mother took him a wife out of the land of Egypt. From this we might infer that the race of Ishmael were on good terms with the race occupying Egypt, and that their royal families were united in close relationship. *Genesis xxi. 21.*

I have ventured to suggest that Abraham's first visit to Egypt typified the occupation of the country by the Hyksos.

I will now hazard another very bold

conjecture : may we not see in the book of Joshua a record of the retreat of the Hyksos, and their occupation of Palestine ?

Exodus xiii. 17.

We learn from the Egyptian monuments that the Hyksos, who became called Philistines, did retreat from Egypt and conquered Palestine ; and as these Philistines were occupying Judea when the Hebrew slaves were expelled from Egypt and were never dislodged, the conquest of the country could not have been effected by the Hebrews, hence the conquering armies under Moses and Joshua could not have been Hebrews. It becomes therefore apparent that the wars of Joshua, as related in the Book of Joshua, must apply to the Hyksos conquest. If this view is a correct one, it very glaringly illustrates how history has been distorted.

It will be noticed the imposition skilfully carries out the design I have indicated, for the Hebrews apparently are placed in possession of their promised land ; and the Hyksos Philistine Jews vanish in a transformation scene.

It will be interesting here to glance at

the ancient legends relating to the Hyksos; but let us understand their authority is open to grave suspicion. Cardinal Newman tells us, "That all knowledge of the Latin classics comes to us from the Mediæval copies of them, and they who transcribed them had an opportunity of forging or garbling them. We are simply at their mercy."

See Edwin Johnson's Rise of Christendom, p. 15.

Could it be doubted that the priests would garble or destroy every shred of evidence inconsistent with their design?

We gather from Manetho, a learned Egyptian priest, who wrote a history of his country about 280 B.C., that "the Egyptian lowlands were at one time overrun by a wild and rude people who came from the regions of the East, conquered the native kings who dwelt there, and took possession of the whole country without meeting any great opposition on the part of the Egyptians. The whole people bore the name of Hyksos."

Brugsch's Egypt, vol. i. 262.

According to another tradition mentioned by Julius Africanus, we learn that the Hyksos kings were said to have been Phœnicians, that is, the Kheta or Hittites.

These Hyksos are also recognised from monumental inscriptions as the Men, or Menti; they are also traced in the name Rutennu, or Ruthen.

In the great catalogue of the towns of Western Asia, conquered by Thotmes III., whose inhabitants submitted to the Egyptian rule after the battle of Megiddo, they are described as all the population of the upper land of Rutennu, and Brugsch adds: "This proves in the most positive manner that the name of Upper Rutennu must have coincided almostly exactly with the country included later within the boundaries of the twelve tribes of Israel."

Brugsch's Egypt, vol. i. 269.

Now, if the Hyksos, who were expelled from Egypt, are discovered occupying the country of the twelve tribes of Israel, we must conclude that the Hyksos had conquered and occupied their country.

It has been ascertained from the monuments and other authentic sources that the Hyksos were expelled from Egypt during the 17th Egyptian Dynasty, and Aahmes, their conqueror, became the founder of the 18th Dynasty. It has also been dis-

Brugsch, vol. i. 263.

covered that Aphosis was the King of the Hyksos at the time of their retreat ; and if we find the Hyksos occupying Palestine during the 18th and 19th Dynasties, where are the records of this revolution, unless we can find them in the Book of Joshua ?

Bunsen's Egypt, vol. i. 193.

We gather from Bunsen that during the first century A.D. a controversy took place between two celebrated scholars as to the origin of the Jews. Apion contended that the exodus under Moses was nothing else but a revolt of leprous outcasts, who, at a much later period, established themselves under an apostate priest, Osarsiph, of Heliopolis, in the ancient Hyksos city [of Tanis], which had been made over to them, and then called to their aid the old enemies of the empire. Josephus, in answer, asserts : "That the Jews are the old lords of Egypt, who, after many centuries of glorious dominion, at length quitted it under an honourable convention and the guidance of Moses *long before* the supposed date of that fabulous story." This view of the great scholar Josephus respecting the origin of the

Jews must convince us that he was not the Jewish historian known as Flavius Josephus.

Legends and fables are very useful to the imaginative historian, for they may probably be founded on some dim historical basis, from which by careful deduction may be framed a possible conjecture of what might have happened previous to authentic records.

Viewing them in this light, I venture to suggest whether both these legends relating to an exodus from Egypt may not have an historical basis. One refers to the retreat of the Hyksos under their King Aphosis, corrupted into Moses. The other refers to the expulsion of Israelite slaves at a much later period. The retreat of the Hyksos, or rather the conquest of Palestine, may be found in the Book of Joshua; the retreat of the Israelites may be traced in the Book of Judges; both of which books have been distorted to suit the design of the priestly writers.

The Book of Joshua, when freed from its palpable distortions, would exactly describe a general conquest of all Palestine by the Hyksos, who were now called Philistines.

This is no rash conjecture, for it is absolutely certain the Hyksos were expelled from Egypt under their King Aphosis (*i.e.* Moses), and afterwards occupied Palestine, and continued to occupy it; for we find Ramses the Second after a life struggle entered into a treaty with them, which left the two powers masters of the Western Empire. *Brugsch, vol. i. 269.*

Now let us follow the records of Joshua relating to his conquest: "And Joshua at that time turned back and took Hazor, and they smote all the souls that were therein, and there was not any left to breathe. As the Lord commanded Moses [*i.e.* Aphosis] so did Moses command Joshua. So Joshua took all that land, the hills, and all that south country. So Joshua took the whole land, and the land rested from war." *Joshua xi. 10.* *Joshua xi. 23.*

We have here the Hyksos settled as masters of Palestine by conquest.

Now let us turn to Judges: "Now these are the nations that the Lord left to prove *Israel*, viz. the five lords of the Philistines, and all the Canaanites." *Judges iii. 1.*

"Israel" here must undoubtedly apply to the Hebrews. "And the children of

Israel dwelt among the Canaanites, Hittites, and Amorites, and Perizzites, and Hivites, and Jebusites, and they took their daughters to be their wives, and gave their daughters to their sons and served their Gods." This is clearly a very different occupation of the country from the one described by Joshua.

It is very well known that the Hyksos under their King, Aphosis, had not been reduced to slavery. The retreat, therefore, of the Hyksos cannot possibly refer to an exodus from Egypt, of a race reduced to slavery; this in itself must prove there were two exoduses; and it becomes glaringly apparent, when we refer to the records in the Book of Exodus relating to an expulsion of slaves: "And it came to pass when Pharaoh had let the people go, that God led them not through the way of the land of the *Philistines*, although that was near; for God said, 'Lest peradventure the people repent when they see war, and they return to Egypt.'"

Exodus xiii 17.

This certainly must prove that the Hyksos entered Palestine by the ordinary

road, a comparatively short march, and that the Hyksos were in possession of Palestine before the exodus of the slaves took place ; and, as we are told, these slaves entered Palestine to the north of Judea, it becomes absolutely certain that the retreat of the Hebrew slaves from Egypt was in no way connected with the retreat of the Hyksos Philistines to Palestine. We can only infer that the Hebrew historians, in order to give a basis for their priestly cult, have distorted the records so as to make it appear that their chosen and God-protected people were in possession of their promised land.

The reader will perhaps imagine that I am begging the question, when I refer with such confidence to the retreat of the Hyksos from Egypt, as distinct from the exodus of the Hebrew slaves. I must contend that there is no doubt as to the retreat of the Hyksos ; it is a fact proved beyond dispute and accepted by all authorities that Aahmes, during the seventeenth Egyptian dynasty, overthrew the Hyksos race under their King, Aphosis, and founded

the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty at Thebes, when the Hyksos retreated to the Delta, and they were not expelled from the Delta till the time of Thotmes III., some forty years after, and then they occupied Palestine.

The exodus of this race from Egypt, obscured under the name of the Hyksos, is dated by high authorities to have occurred during the sixteenth century B.C.; and I shall show that the people occupying Judea at a later date, and known under the name of Jews, also date their exodus from Egypt to precisely this period. We can therefore reasonably infer that the Jews were the descendants of the Hyksos. And if we understand that the retreat of the Hyksos, and their occupation of Palestine, can be traced in the Book of Joshua when freed from distortions, we have a record of events concerning the Jews exactly tallying with the monuments and all known inscriptions.

The design of the priests is glaringly manifest; it was vital to their cult that the Hebrews, as the chosen people of their God, should be in possession of their promised

land. So the Hyksos, and other powerful families must be obscured at all hazards.

We have been hoodwinked by priest-craft; Judea and Israel were not little isolated kingdoms, but provinces of a mighty empire, just as they are at the present moment, and just as they have been since the time of Abraham. It is inconsistent with reason to suppose an independent king could hold Judea, the gate of Asia and Africa. Such a position would enable him to tax all merchandise passing through his territory; and taxation is the symbol of supremacy, and can only be enforced by a sovereign power. A king of Judea could not have assumed such a position against the powers of Egypt, Carchemish, and Assyria.

CHAPTER II.

I HAVE endeavoured to trace the Hyksos from their entry into Egypt to their retreat and occupation of Palestine, as described in the book of Joshua; and, as I contend that there must have been two distinct exoduses from Egypt, let us glance back to the Biblical records to see if we cannot discover another exodus of a totally different character.

Another great family appears on the scene, and under Jacob an attempt is undoubtedly made to secure power in Egypt, and we might suppose before they left, a treaty would be arranged to secure a retreat in case of failure; and it would appear such a treaty was entered into between the family of Jacob, and the Hyksos who are now called Philistines. I admit it is only conjecture, but I give it for what it is worth.

Abraham is typical of the Empire, and the record I am about to refer to may apply to some other expedition, but it very accurately describes a treaty which might have been made with the family of Jacob when they left Palestine to try their fortunes in Egypt:—

Genesis xxi. 22.

"And it came to pass at that time, that Abimelech and Phicol the chief captain of his host, spake unto Abraham, saying, God is with thee in all that thou doest. Now therefore swear unto me here by God that thou wilt not deal falsely with me, nor with my son, nor with my son's son; but according to the kindness that I have done unto thee thou shalt do unto me, and to the land wherein thou hast sojourned. And Abraham said, I will swear."

Undoubtedly, the record refers to some treaty made with the Philistines, for Abimelech is certainly a Philistine king.

The expedition of the family of Jacob against Egypt is clothed in poetical language. We find Joseph, who was apparently the pioneer, gets into trouble, from which we may conjecture he was not at first successful,

but afterwards with the assistance of Jacob and all his forces, they arrive at high distinction, and hold their position for several generations. The narratives however tell us they were eventually reduced to slavery, and were forced to retire.

Here then a second exodus is revealed to us; the Philistines break their covenant and refuse them admission into Judea. Unlike the retreat of the Hyksos from Egypt, no allusion whatever is discovered in the Egyptian archives to recall any such event, so we may readily conjecture that the Hebrews in a destitute condition, gradually slipped into the country in bands, half shepherds half brigands, as described so graphically by M. Maspero, where they settled among their kinsmen the Israelites, as narrated in the book of Judges:—"And the children of Israel dwelt among the Canaanites, Hittites and Amorites and Perezzites, and Hivites and Jebusites." Freely married with their neighbours, and served their gods. I must submit this simple friendly mode of settling in Palestine cannot possibly have any connection with

Maspero's Peuples de L'Orient, 304.

Judges iii. 5.

the war-like conquest of the country by Joshua.

I have pointed out that the records found in the book of Joshua applied to the retreat of the Hyksos and their occupation of Palestine, but they have been distorted, in order to lead us to infer that they applied to a Hebrew conquest of the country, by which means we are led to infer that the Hebrews were actually in possession of their promised land. The imposition has been effected by alluding to the forces of Joshua as the children of Israel; and probably they were the children of Israel. But as more than four hundred years had elapsed since their occupation of Egypt, they had become quite a distinct race, in manners, customs, religion and language, and they certainly were not the children of Israel known as the Hebrews. This is proved, for it is recorded the Philistines or Hyksos entered Palestine by the short march from Egypt, and we are told the Hebrews entered Palestine for fear of the Philistines, by the east, and crossed the Jordan near Jericho. Thus it becomes clear that the

Exodus xiii. 17.

Philistines, who had previously entered Palestine by the south, were not the Hebrews, or Israelites: and as I have shown that the Hyksos who retreated from Egypt under their king Aphosis conquered and occupied Palestine, and were called Philistines, and as these Philistines were occupying the country when the Hebrews made their entry, it becomes clear that two exoduses from Egypt are indicated, and the retreat of the slaves could not have been the same exodus as the exodus of the Philistines under Aphosis.

Brusseh, vol. i. 269.

Again, when we ascertain through unquestionably authentic records, that the Hyksos did retreat from Egypt under their king Aphosis, and that they did occupy exactly the country occupied by a leader of a retreat from Egypt, named Moses. We are forced to conjecture that the two leaders Aphosis and Moses are identical personages. This conclusion becomes still stronger when we find, that if these two leaders are identical, the Hyksos mystery, the origin of the Jews, and the history of Egypt is revealed to us in a new and natural light. This

would also explain to us that the Chaldeans were the grand civilizers of the world, and not the effete Egyptian fellaheen.

I will not attempt to unravel all the intricacies of the Biblical plot, but merely endeavour to trace summarily the fortunes of the great Chaldean empire, the account of which has been obscured in the narratives of the Hebrew historians, with the view of focussing our minds on a special priestly cult, thereby distracting our attention from general history.

I have ventured to suggest that a Chaldean family, known as the Hyksos, occupied Egypt and held it for some four or five centuries, when they were forced to retreat, owing to a rival family supplanting them at the time of Aahmes, the founder of the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty. It has been ascertained that these two rival families remained in conflict with each other during several centuries, when a treaty was arranged between them. All the details of this treaty between Ramses II. and the King of the Kheta are handed down to us on the monuments.

Brugsch's Egypt, vol. ii. 76.

We are indebted to Brugsch for a complete translation, and he tells us :—"In such a form were peace and friendship made at Ramses, the city in Lower Egypt, between the two most powerful nations of the world." Here, then, we have a treaty of peace between two powerful monarchs. Their religion is almost identical, they both worship the great God Sutekh or Set—the predecessor of Ramses was named Seti; this is most important to notice, as it proves that the power of Egypt and the power of the Kheta had a common religion. We may confidently view this treaty as a great landmark in history.

The power of Egypt is well defined. The power of the Kheta may be reduced to a certainty, it included the empire of the ancient Hittites, which Professor Sayce has described as a "Forgotten Empire;" and we can readily imagine this treaty between these two great powers was a coalition against the power of Assyria; so we may be confident at this epoch the great Chaldean empire is broken up into three distinct monarchies — Egypt, Syria, and Assyria.

This would be about 1350 B.C. The treaty is cemented by Ramses II. marrying the daughter of the Kheta King, and the young wife as Queen received the name of Ur-maa Nofiru-ra. The signature of this treaty would synchronise with the period alluded to by the Hebrew historians as the time of the Judges. With this treaty in view, witnessed before the great god Sutekh or Set, how bald and contracted appear the narratives contained in the Book of Judges. Although probably founded on authentic records, we may dismiss them all as irrelevant to the supreme affairs of the empire, which they are designed to conceal.

Brugsch, vol. ii. 78.

It must, on reflection, strike us as remarkable that although we have a book purporting to be a history of the Jews and the Israelites, no one is any the wiser as to their antecedents ; and the empire of which they must have formed an integral part is lost to view.

I must again recall that the Hyksos family were supplanted by the family of Jacob, under Aahmes, who founded the brilliant eighteenth dynasty which terminated in a

religious revolution and the overthrow of the Aahmes dynasty. May we not trace in this the influence of the Hyksos family? We have seen that Ramses II., the great warrior of the nineteenth dynasty, made a treaty, offensive and defensive, with the Kheta, which will convince us the two powers could meet on equal terms, and the royal families became allied by marriage. It, however, becomes clear that the Pharaohs had their troubles, and by no means reigned over a united country. Undoubtedly revolutions and stirring events took place soon after the iron hand of Ramses II. was removed; and it has been supposed that the exodus of slaves from Egypt took place about this period, not that we have any single record referring to such an event, but simply because there are recorded many serious disturbances about the period when Meneptah II. was reigning. But it has been convincingly proved that this Pharaoh was not drowned in the Red Sea, for his tomb has been discovered and inscriptions have been found which record that the Pharaoh was "blessed by *Amen* with a

good old age, after a life-time of pleasure and a most prosperous reign." And the record ends by stating, "Thou hast gone before the Gods, the Victor, the Justified."

I shall point out as I proceed, that we may reasonably surmise the expulsion of slaves from Egypt took place soon after the accession of Hirhor, who founded the twenty-first dynasty.

The following record reveals the political situation of the country: "Thus says King Ramses III. Hearken! I make you to know my glorious deeds, which I have performed as king of men. The people of Egypt lived in banishment abroad, so passed away long years; the land of Egypt belonged to princes of foreign parts. Other times came on afterwards, during years of scarcity. Arisu, a Phœnician, had raised himself among them to be a prince, and he compelled all the people to pay him tribute." We have here the Kheta dominating Egypt. This would fall in about 1220 B.C. *Brugsch, vol. ii. 143.*

I will now refer to another inscription of considerable interest, for it informs us that

Ramses III. inflicted a severe defeat on the Kheta or Phœnicians, and we find him as far north as Cilicia and Carchemish, which guarded the northern fords of the Euphrates, and was the most important fortress of the Kheta, so at this period Ramses III. must have held sway over the whole Western Empire.

Brugsch, vol. ii. 164.

According to a statement in the Harris papyrus, Ramses III. erected in the land of Zahi (Philistia) a Ramesseum to Amen, in the city of Kanaan, a statue of the god was set up in its holy of holies in the name of the King. Here, then, we have an authentic record which proves beyond a doubt that the worship of Amen was followed in Palestine.

Brugsch, vol. ii. 191.

Another inscription of the Pharaoh Ramses XII. leads us to infer that he ruled over all Syria: "When the Pharaoh was in the river land of Naharain, *as his custom was every year*, the Kings of all the nations came with humility and friendship to the person of the Pharaoh. From the extremest ends of their countries they brought the gifts of gold, silver, blue and green stones,

&c., &c." Here, then, we have the Egyptian Pharaoh ruling over Palestine, Western Asia, and Egypt.

During the reign of Ramses XII., a priest of Amen of the name of Hirhor, succeeded to the throne, banished the Ramessides, and founded the twenty-first dynasty.

In Hirhor we can trace a descendant of Aphosis (*i.e.* Moses); at this period, therefore, the Hyksos family would be again supreme in Egypt, and worshippers of Amen. They would not only banish the royal and influential families, but would reduce the common people to servitude. We might, therefore, reasonably conjecture that Hirhor was the Pharaoh who "knew not Joseph." *Exodus i. 8.*

Now, we may surmise that though the Hyksos were supplanted in Egypt by the family of Jacob, that is by the people known as Israelites, the Hyksos secured dominion in Palestine, and probably Syria, and there supplanted the Israelites. So the Hyksos were by no means subdued, and the two families were still powerful rivals.

It will be noticed that a great element of confusion is imported into the Biblical nar-

ratives by the compilers alluding to both the Hyksos and the Hebrews as Israelites. *Psalms cxiv.* But if we rectify this and read—When the Hyksos went out of Egypt, Judea was their sanctuary and Israel their dominion. Then the Israelites and the Hyksos stand out of the picture clearly before us as two great families struggling for empire, and I must conjecture they represent the powers of Egypt and Assyria.

The Hyksos would now be supreme in Egypt, and if my reasoning is correct, we should find the Hyksos also in power in Palestine.

When we turn to the Biblical records we *Judges xiii. 1.* find—"That the children of Israel did evil again in the sight of the Lord, and the Lord delivered them into the hands of the Philistines [that is the Hyksos] forty years."

I. Samuel xiii. 19. "Now there was no smith found throughout all the land of Israel, for the Philistines said lest the Hebrews make themselves swords and spears. And all the Israelites went down to the Philistines to sharpen every man his spear, and his coulter, and his axe and his mattock.

It becomes evident, that Achish the Philistine King of Gath was supreme in Palestine, and a worshipper of Amen. And here we must notice that the Hebrews are disclosed on the scene as a distinct community, unarmed, amongst the Israelites. Might we not reasonably conjecture that the Hyksos Pharaoh Hirhor had expelled them from Egypt. So we may date the exodus of the Hebrew slaves as having occurred about this period.

As I have ventured to suggest that the worship of Amen-ra was followed in Palestine, it will be interesting to notice Professor Sayce's remarks on the Tel el-Amarna tablets, which disclose an official correspondence between Palestine and Egypt about 1430, B.C.: "The letters from Palestine establish the fact that reading and writing were widely known and practised in the country at the close of the fifteenth century before our era. But the writing was that of Babylonia, thus proving the deep impression which had been made by Babylonian culture upon western Asia. It is difficult to account for the impression,

Records of the Past (N. S.) vol. 5, page 64 (N. S.).

except upon the hypothesis of Babylonian conquest." This would seem to support my conjecture that the Egyptian conquerors known to us as the Hyksos, were the Babylonians, who retreating from Ur of Chaldea, invaded the country under Abraham.

Records of the Past (N. S.), vol. ii. page 60.

Professor Sayce informs us that the Vizier of Khu-en-aten bore the name of Dudu, the Dodo and David of the Old Testament; and we gather from M. Maspero's translation of King Smendes's stele, that he also bore the name of Nsbindidi. This Smendes is Hirhor, the priest of Amen, the founder of the 21st Egyptian Dynasty; his name, Nsbindidi, meaning, "The follower of the Ram;" the Ram being the symbol of Amen-ra, or the soul of Osiris. Thus we have a connecting link between Hirhor and David.

Vol. v. (N. S.) page 24

Although our authorities date the accession of Hirhor to the throne of Egypt a generation before David, yet we are aware that dates are very problematical, and as we gather from the Biblical narratives that David was a monarch ruling from the

Euphrates, to the river of Egypt, might we not conjecture his rule included Egypt, and Nsbindidi was identical with David? I must contend that David would have been the rightful heir to the throne of Egypt, through Aphosis (*i.e.* Moses), the last Hyksos Pharaoh of the seventeenth dynasty. Undoubtedly the name of Nsbindidi could have been adopted by any Pharaoh who followed the worship of Amen-ra. But still David's name must associate him with that cult, and as he was the practical founder of the Temple in Jerusalem, we might reasonably conjecture it was dedicated to Amen-ra.

See Hibbert Lectures, 1887. First Lecture, by Professor Sayce.

Note.—Since writing the above my conjecture respecting David and Hirhor being identical has been somewhat strengthened, for Dr. Flinders Petrie has discovered that three kings peacefully succeeded Khuenaten of the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty, which would force forward the date ascribed to Hirhor of the 21st dynasty, and would probably make him a contemporary with David of the Old Testament.

Brugsch's Egypt, vol. ii. 202.

Vol. i. 269.

Maspere's Records of the Past (N. S.), vol. v. 24.

I have suggested that Hirhor brought the Hyksos family into power; and, as we know he made the old Hyksos city of Tanis, the Zoan of the Bible, his Royal city, and bore the title of "Lord of the Ruthen" by which name we recognise the Hyksos family in Palestine, we must conclude that Hirhor ruled in Palestine. And as Hirhor bore the name of Nsbindidi, an equivalent to David, and David we know ruled in Palestine, we certainly have some reasonable grounds for surmising that Hirhor and David are one and the same king.

It will be noticed if Aphosis and Moses are identical personages, we can trace both Hirhor and David as rightful heirs to the Egyptian throne; I must therefore contend Moses may be discovered in Aphosis of the 17th Egyptian dynasty, and Hirhor or Nsbindidi, in David of the Old Testament, both worshippers of Amen-ra.

CHAPTER III.

We might anticipate that, when a powerful family like the Hyksos kings of Egypt retired from Egypt, probably displaced by a kindred family, many of their race would continue to hold distinguished positions in the new Government; and if we may conjecture Aphosis, the last of the Hyksos kings of the seventeenth dynasty, to be identical with Moses, we can trace his family occupying high offices of state, and we are enabled to carry them down to the time of Achish, the Philistine or Hyksos King of Gath, for Brugsch points out an inscription in the quarries of Silsilis referring to a certain noble, Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron, a brother of Moses (*i.e.* Aphosis).

Brugsch, vol. ii. 136.

Again another inscription recalls the very influential high priest of Amen, Roi, or Loi (*i.e.* Levi), who under Mineptah held the command of the Legion of Amen, adminis-

tered the treasury of Amen, and was chief architect to the Pharaoh. We also find it recorded in the Biblical narratives, that at the time of the Philistine King Achish, Ahiah the son of Ahitub, Ichabod's brother, the son of Phinehas, the son of Eli, was the Lord's high priest in Shiloh. It thus becomes clear that the Egyptian priests of Amen were of the same family as the priests in Palestine.

I. Samuel xiv. 3.

It cannot be questioned that the office of high priest was hereditary in the Royal family; priests are not easily dislodged, and they do not change their religion. We may therefore be morally certain that all the priests in the line of Aphosis (*i.e.* Moses) were priests of Amen, and it was only natural that the Hyksos should follow the same worship in Palestine as they did in Egypt.

At this period Achish the Philistine king of Gath was supreme in Palestine. He had disarmed the Israelites: "And Saul blew the trumpet throughout all the land, saying, let the *Hebrews* hear; and the Philistines gathered themselves together to fight with

I. Samuel xiii. 3.

Israel, and when the men of Israel saw they were in a strait, then the people hid themselves in caves, and in thickets, and in rocks and in high places, and in pits ; and some of the *Hebrews* went over Jordan."

Again we find it recorded : "Now Israel went out against the Philistines to battle, and when they joined battle Israel was smitten before the Philistines. And when the Philistines heard the noise of the shout, they said, what meaneth the noise of this great shout in the camp of the *Hebrews*. Be strong and quit yourselves like men, O ye Philistines, that ye be not servants unto the *Hebrews ;* and the Philistines fought, and Israel was smitten." *I. Samuel iv. 6.*

The Hebrews and the Israelites, we may conclude, had met with a severe defeat ; and as we are aware when such defeats took place, prisoners were taken and reduced to slavery, we may reasonably conjecture many Hebrews were taken prisoners by the Philistines.

Very shortly after another engagement takes place between the Israelites and the Philistines. "And Saul and all the people *I. Samuel xiv. 20.*

assembled themselves, and they came to the battle and there was a great discomfiture. Moreover the *Hebrews* that were with the Philistines before that time, which went up with them into the camp from the country round about, even they also turned to be with the Israelites that were with Saul and Jonathan.

Here then we have the Hebrews before us as slaves or camp-followers with the Philistine army. And we must notice that they are alluded to as a distinct class from the Israelites. These events occurred during the reign of Hirhor in Egypt; and as this is the first appearance of the *Hebrews* on the scene in Palestine we may reasonably conclude that they arrived in Palestine at this period.

Brugsch, vol. ii. 202.

Now let us return to the banished Ramessides.

It would appear that one of the great grandsons of Ramses XII. contracted a marriage with a daughter of the great king of Assyria, who became known under the name of Karamat. The consequences of

such a connection to the banished, but legitimate, royal race of the Egyptians with the powerful dynasty of Nineveh quickly appeared. The Assyrians marched against Egypt, and the Ramessides are recalled from banishment. While these events were taking place it appears that Naromath, the great king of Assyria, advanced into Egypt with an army, with the intention of conquering the country. Here, in Egypt, death surprised him and he was buried in Abydus, and Shashank was made an Assyrian Satrap. The tablet discovered by Brugsch at Abydus, disclosing this event, has received but slight notice from students, simply because it appears utterly inconsistent with the records in the Biblical narratives.

Brugsch, vol. ii. 208.

It is so important, I will quote Brugsch's remarks on the subject. He tells us the inscription is of unusual magnitude, on the front side of a granite block at Abydus, and can be read without misunderstanding. He gives us the translation of the long inscription and adds : "Who could have expected such direct evidence of the presence of an Assyrian great king in the Valley of the

Nile when the monuments had obstinately suppressed all information of the fact. We can only suppose that the Egyptians, after the departure of their Assyrian great kings, carefully destroyed all their monuments, and that the one we have quoted only escaped the same fate because it was used as a convenient block to work into some building in the cemetery of Abydus."

This precious tablet then, has revealed to us that a son of the great king of Assyria held rule in Egypt at the close of the twenty-first Egyptian dynasty, and that he was buried in the royal cemetery at Abydus, with all the pomp connected with the worship of Osiris. This is very important, for it not only proves that the Assyrians were masters of Egypt and Palestine, but it shews there was no conflict between the priests of Assyria and Egypt; and when we find that the high priests in Jerusalem were the descendants of the high priests in Egypt, we may be sure that the Osirian worship was the base of a general cult over the whole empire and as the Christian religion is based on a Hebrew con-

ception, the foundation of our Trinity is disclosed.

With this Abydus tablet before us, we may be certain that the Assyrians were supreme in Egypt and Palestine at this date, and as we know that Hirhor, a priest of Amen, deposed Ramses XII. of the twentieth Egyptian dynasty, and founded the twenty-first dynasty, we must conclude that the invasion of the Assyrians occurred after the reign of Hirhor and the successors of his dynasty; and as the tablet informs us that Shashank, the son of the great king of Assyria, was made king of Egypt, it becomes conclusive that the events we are discussing may be dated to the close of the twenty-first dynasty.

Brugsch's Egypt, vol. ii. 207.

Now it has been ascertained that David ascended the throne within a few years of 1061 B.C., and we gather from the Biblical narratives he ruled from the Euphrates to the river of Egypt, and as we find Hirhor the Pharaoh of Egypt bore the name of Nsbindidi, a name compounded with David, and also bore the title of Lord of the Ruthen, that is, the people of Palestine,

II. Samuel viii. 3.

my conjecture becomes strengthened that Hirhor was identical with David; hence we may date the reign of Hirhor (*i.e.* David) to about 1061 B.C. The date given by Brugsch is 1100 B.C., but as I have pointed out that Dr. Flinders Petrie has discovered that three kings succeeded Khuenaten of the eighteenth dynasty, we may with reason push forward Brugsch's date forty years, in which case Hirhor's accession would exactly synchronise with that of David; and when we learn that on the death of David his kingdom was broken up, and soon after, the Assyrians under Shashank became masters of Egypt, we may date the taking of Jerusalem by Shashank, the founder of the Assyrian-Egyptian twenty-second dynasty, to about 975 B.C. in the fifth year of Rehoboam's reign in Judea.

Brugsch's Egypt, vol. ii. 344.

I. Kings, xi. 25.

I. Kings, xiv. 25.

George Smith dates this event to 976 B.C. Hence it becomes only reasonable to conjecture that David's (*i.e.* Hirhor's) wars with the Israelites represent the struggle between the powers of Egypt and Assyria for supremacy alluded to in the Abydus tablet.

The Assyrian Eponym Canon, page. 198.

I must beg the reader to understand that

this is no new theory; for the learned scholar Josephus (not the spurious Flavius Josephus) asserts: "that the Jews are the old lords of Egypt, who, after many centuries of glorious dominion, at length quitted it under an honorable convention, and the guidance of Moses:" and Bunsen himself adds: "in our judgment there is no better grounded hypothesis than that of the affinity of race between the Hyksos and the Jews." Hence when we find that Aphosis the last king of the Egyptian seventeenth dynasty did lead the Hyksos out of Egypt at the precise date given by the Biblical writers as the date of the Jewish exodus, we are forced to the conclusion that Moses and Aphosis are identical.

Bunsen's Egypt, vol. 193.

Ibid.

I. Kings, iv. 1.

Again, we learn from Strabo, speaking of Judea: "Most of the country is said to be inhabited by mixed tribes of Egyptians, Arabians, and Phœnicians, there being such a mixture of population, the prevailing report of those connected with the Temple in Jerusalem, say that: The ancestors of those now called Jews were Egyptians. Here then again we have massive evidence

Exodus xiii. 17.

that the Jews were the descendants of the Hyksos; and as we know that the Hyksos, after their retreat from Egypt, acquired the name of Philistines, it becomes apparent that the Jews were the Philistines, and as the Philistines were not the chosen people of priestcraft, it is obvious why their history has been distorted and obscured by the Biblical historians.

I must therefore submit that the Hebrews were a family foreign to the Jews, and they could never have secured any kind of supremacy in their would-be promised land.

We now approach a very complicated scene in the drama. Wellhausen, reviewing the early chapters of the 1st Book of Samuel, is fairly bewildered, and adds: "There cannot be a word of truth in the whole narrative."

Wellhausen's History of Israel, 249.

With the greatest diffidence I must contend there is a substratum of truth to be found in the naratives: the Biblical plot has only sustained itself by resting its design on authentic records; the writers rely solely on adroit distortions, where the truth is made to conceal the truth. The

incidents connected with the lives of Achish, Saul, and David have no doubt a foundation of truth in them; it is this basis of truth that has made them so dangerous.

I have, I trust, proceeded far enough in my argument to convince the reader that we are not dealing with simple shepherds and village priests, but with characters who occupy commanding positions in a mighty empire. Achish is the King of the great Hyksos-Philistine family, and Saul, I must conjecture, was a royal representative of the Assyrian power; we have only to free the records from distortions, and true history is revealed.

We must remember it was vital to the designs of the writers that David should appear as a Hebrew; but as he succeeds Achish, the Philistine King, shortly after a decided Philistine victory, we should naturally conclude David was a Philistine. *I. Samuel xxxi. 7.*

It must be admitted that Achish King of Gath was supreme in Palestine before Saul's reign, and as the Israelites were disarmed, it would lead us to conclude that they were under subjection; I have hinted that Saul, *I. Samuel xiii. 19.*

with the assistance of the Assyrians, defeated the Philistines and secured the independence of Israel, and we find him with his forces in Judea, where many battles take place; and the Philistines clearly retreat to their strong holds on the sea coast.

I. Samuel xiv. 52.

II. Samuel iii. 1.

Although it is recorded that there was sore war against the Philistines all the days of Saul, it is also recorded there was long war between the House of David and the House of Saul.

Now, if we are to consider David was an Israelite, it will be noticed, that if there was sore war between Saul and the Philistines, and long war between David and Saul, we must understand that the Israelites were engaged in civil war, and if we accept that David was in conflict with the Philistines, we must suppose that the Philistines were fighting against both sections of the Israelite forces. Hence Saul would be at war with David and the Philistines; and David would be at war with Saul and the Philistines; and the Philistines would be in conflict with both Saul and David. Such a three-cornered position is hardly conceivable. I

must then contend that the records leading us to believe that David was a simple Israelite shepherd boy and a scourge to the Philistines, are only inserted with the view of giving us to understand that David was no Philistine. David's genealogy is given us, and as we find him descended from Moses, and so back to Adam, we could hardly expect to find him the drudge of a large family tending sheep on the hill side; but if we eliminate these distortions, we come to more reliable history when we find David a general in the Philistine camp, living with Achish, the Philistine king. *I. Samuel xxi. 10.*

At the close of Saul's career the Israelites appear to have been worsted, for we find the Philistine forces encamped in Jezreel far in the north of Saul's territory. A general engagement takes place at Gilboa, and if we credit the Biblical records, the Israelites suffered a severe defeat. Saul and three of his sons appear to have been killed in the action. And the Israelites are said to have evacuated the country. As we hear nothing more of King Achish we may suppose he was killed in the engagement. But it is *I. Samuel xxxi. 1.*

remarkable that his death is not alluded to.

The results of the battle of Gilboa are very perplexing, for although the Israelites are said to have escaped over the Jordan, and the Philistines occupied the country, yet they seem to rise Phœnix-like out of their crushing defeat; for Eshbaal, Saul's son, is declared king over all Israel in the north, and David in the south; and King Achish and his victorious Philistines suddenly disappear from view.

It will be noticed that this is exactly what the Hebrew writers would wish us to infer; for it placed the chosen people of their God, apparently, in possession of their promised land. But if we credit the narratives, which tell us that the Israelites were crushed at Gilboa, fled over the Jordan and left the country in the possession of the Philistines, it becomes clear the Philistines would be absolute masters of the country, which we know they had occupied for many centuries.

I Samuel xxxi. 7.

Under such circumstances we might have supposed that David was Achish's son, and

on Achish's death succeeded him as the legitimate heir ; for it is contrary to reason to suppose that the Philistines, after centuries of conflict with the Israelites, should at the moment of victory have permitted the Israelites to nominate their king.

I must conjecture, however, that the narratives are based on authentic records, but they have been skilfully distorted to exalt the Israelites. I offer the suggestion with hesitation, but might we not possibly believe that David was closely connected by birth to both the royal houses of Achish and Saul, and on their death united the western empire. He was undoubtedly opposed by Saul's family, but they were soon disposed of, and we may gather from the Biblical narratives he acquired dominion from the Euphrates to the river of Egypt. This would synchronise with the rule of Hirhor the priest king in Egypt. And the Hebrew historians complacently add : "And David reigned over all Israel, and David executed judgment and justice unto all his people." Wishing us to infer that God's chosen people, the Israelites, were in full

II. Samuel viii. 3.

II. Samuel viii. 15.

II. Samuel viii. 16.

power, and in possession of their promised land; but the following records shatter this view: "And Joab the son of Zeruiah was over the host, and Jehoshaphat the son of Ahilud was recorder; and Zadok the son of Ahitub, and Abimelech the son of Abiathar were the priests, and Seraiah was the scribe. And Benaiah the son of Jehoiada was over both the *Cherethites* and the *Pelethites*, and David's sons were chief rulers." These are all pure Hyksos Philistines; so it becomes apparent that the Philistines were supreme, and the Israelites were in subjection under them.

We may therefore conjecture that the battle of Gilboa was a contest for empire between the forces of Egypt and Assyria.

If we can rely on the Biblical genealogies, it becomes apparent that David was a Hittite or Philistine. I append the genealogical list.

Genesis xxiii. 8. 10. Campbell's Hittites, vol. ii., 54. I. Chronicles ii. 10.

Zohar.
Ephron *the Hittite*.
Jephunneh.
Caleb. Joshua xiv. 6.
Ram.

Amminadab.
Salma.
Boaz.
Obed.
Jesse.
David.

And as we are unquestionably led to believe by the writers that the Hebrews were not Hittites, we must conclude that David was not a Hebrew.

CHAPTER IV.

As it is certain that a Hebrew community existed, let us endeavour to trace its origin.

It is recorded that the family of Jacob rose to high distinction in Egypt during several generations, but were eventually reduced to slavery, and escaped out of the country.

It will be admitted that these slaves became known as Hebrews. As Israelites they left Palestine, as Hebrews they returned and settled in Israel, the Philistines having opposed their entry into Judea. Having lost all their possessions in Egypt, they occupied on their return to Palestine a low caste among their kindred, the Israelites, and acquired the name of Hebrews, to distinguish them from the Israelites dwelling in Israel before they arrived.

It was the aim of the Hebrew writers to obscure their misfortunes, so they appear

on the scene as incorporated into the Israelite nation, and they are associated with all the incidents relating to Israelite history.

But we must carefully bear in mind that the *Hebrews alone* are God's chosen people, and sole heirs to the supposed Divine promise. So let us distinctly understand that the Biblical cult is centred in the Hebrew community, to the absolute exclusion of all others.

If it can be shown the Hebrews were the only special objects of the Almighty's protection, even if the Israelites were in possession of Palestine, it would only prove that the Hebrews themselves were not in possession of their promised land.

It will be perhaps needless to point out that, as the Hebrews have been incorporated with the Israelites, we should of necessity lose sight of them. Thus it would only be through imperfections in the plot, or through the stringent necessity of keeping them dimly in view, that we would be able to trace them at all.

But I must go further, and contend, if

it can be shown that the Hebrews were a distinct community to the Israelites, it would prove that they held no kind of supremacy in Palestine; consequently were not in possession of their promised land. And this is one of the presumedly strongest links in the assumed chain that connects them with the Divine promise, and with universal dominion.

We have presumed that they acquired the name of Hebrews through some prominent ancestor of the seed of Abraham, and some high ecclesiastical authorities go so far as to class them with Heber; but this clashes with the priestly historians, for it is recorded that Abraham himself was a Hebrew.

Genesis xiv. 13.

We must also notice how carefully this line is traced. Joseph is a Hebrew. He is not only a Hebrew, but Palestine, whence he migrated, was in possession of the Hebrews. Moses was a Hebrew.

Genesis xxxix. 14.

It was vital to the priestly cult that the Hebrews should appear as the sole heirs of the Divine promises, so the priestly historians were forced to place them on

the scene as a distinct and ancient community.

We will now turn to the early years of Saul's reign over Israel.

He is engaged in hostilities with the Philistines under Achish king of Gath. "And Saul and all the people that were with him assembled themselves and they came to the battle, and there was a very great discomfiture. Moreover the *Hebrews* that were with the Philistines before that time, which went up with them into the camp from the country round about, even they also turned to be with the *Israelites* that were with Saul and Jonathan." *I. Samuel xiv. 20.*

I submit that this record must force us to infer that the Hebrews were a community distinct from the Israelites, and that they occupied a low caste as camp followers with the Philistine army; and it must also prove that they were not in possession of their promised land. This menial position of the Hebrews is confirmed in the records of Jeremiah, written some five centuries after these events: "This is the word that came to Jeremiah from the Lord, after that the *Jeremiah xxxv. 9.*

King Zedekiah had made a covenant with all the people which were in Jerusalem to proclaim liberty unto them. That every man should let his man servant, and every man his maid servant, *being an Hebrew* or *an Hebrewess*, go free. Now when all the princes and all the people heard that every one should let his man servant and every one his maid servant go free, then they obeyed and let them go. But afterwards they turned and caused the servants and the handmaids whom they had let go free to return, and brought them into subjection for servants and for handmaids."

From this we gather that the Hebrews were reduced to a position of comparative slavery, and that they were clearly not in possession of their promised land.

We may therefore dismiss them as factors in the great Eastern Empire ; and I must beg the reader to notice that if the Kings of Judea and Israel were not Hebrews, the Biblical plot is disclosed.

CHAPTER V.

We have left David supreme monarch of Western Asia, he has divided the empire with the great Assyrian King. *II. Samuel viii. 3.*

The narratives relating to the rebellion of Absalom would lead us to conjecture that David was more Philistine than Israelite. But it certainly indicates that he was connected by blood with the Israelite tribe of Judah, for when the tribe of Judah is defeated and he returns to Jerusalem: *II. Samuel xix. 11.*

"David sent to Zadok and Abiathar the priests, saying, Speak unto the elders of Israel, saying, Why are ye the last to bring the king back to his house? Ye are my brethren, ye are my bones and my flesh: wherefore then are ye the last to bring back the king? And say ye to Amasa, Art thou not of my bone and of my flesh? God do so to me, and more also, if thou be not captain of the host before me con-

tinually in the room of Joab. And he bowed the heart of all the men of Judah even as the heart of one man ; so that they sent this word unto the king, Return thou, and all thy servants."

II Samuel xviii. 6.

It will be noticed we are now in presence of a general revolution of the Israelite tribes ; although David probably succeeded King Achish as the rightful heir of the Philistine throne, he was, perhaps, able, through blood relationship with the tribe of Judah, to unite the two parties and become king over all Israel. But we may easily detect this was only accomplished through his influence as Philistine king.

I have already pointed out that David was mainly supported by Philistine troops, which are alluded to as Cherethites and Pelethites and Gittites of Gath by the Hebrew historian, with the view of obscuring the Philistine power. That the Cherethites embraced the whole nation of the Philistines cannot be questioned, for we have records which distinctly confirm this.

Zephaniah, prophesying against the Philis-

tines, says: "Woe unto the inhabitants of the sea coasts, the nation of the *Cherethites!* the word of the Lord is against you, O Canaan, the land of the Philistines." Thus it becomes clear that the Philistines were Cherethites, and that they occupied Canaan, and continued to occupy it up to the date of Zephaniah, about 640 B.C.

Zephaniah ii. 5.

And again Ezekiel, about 600 B.C., prophesies against the Philistines: "Therefore, thus says the Lord God: Behold I will stretch out mine hand upon the Philistines, and I will cut off the Cherethites and destroy the remnant of the sea coast."

Ezekiel xxv. 16.

We are thus led distinctly to understand that David's Cherethite troops are Philistines.

We might readily conjecture Absalom's rebellion to have been brought about through the merciless manner in which Joab, David's general, treated any indication of revolt on the part of the Israelites. And David, with a view of conciliating the malcontents, deposes Joab, and makes Amasa the captain of the host.

It will be seen that Joab resents this, and very shortly after murders Amasa.

II. Samuel xx. 10.

There can hardly be a doubt that Joab was acting by David's instructions, for it removed a formidable rival. David was diplomatic, and always removed his enemies by diplomatic means, and freely shed tears over their graves.

II. Samuel xxi. 9.

As soon as the Israelite rebellion is put down, he hands over seven of Saul's sons to the Gibeonites to appease the Philistines, and then to conciliate the Israelites he collects the bones of Saul and Jonathan and buries them in their ancestral sepulchre.

II. Samuel xx. 1.

Such a massacre of the royal family of the Israelites naturally rouses their indignation, and a man of Belial, whose name was Sheba, probably one of the royal family, blew a trumpet, and said: "We have no part in David, neither have we inheritance in the son of Jesse! every man to his tents, O Israel." This would indicate that the eleven tribes of Israel did not recognise David as their national king, and as Sheba, the leader of the Israelites, is alluded to as a man of Belial, we may conjecture the record comes from a Philistine source.

David orders his general, Joab, to pursue

after Sheba and put down the revolt. "And there went after him Joab's men (that is the loyal men of the tribe of Judah) and the Cherethites, and the Pelethites, and all the mighty men (that is the Philistines) to pursue after Sheba, the son of Bichri."

II. Samuel xx. 10.

Joab takes this opportunity for murdering Amasa, the captain of the tribe of Judah: "And one of Joab's men stood by him, and said, He that favoureth Joab, and he that is for David, let him go after Joab;" and we may naturally conclude that the tribe of Judah retired in dismay. And it was only the Philistines that followed in pursuit of Sheba.

We shall notice the tribe of Judah, although forced to submit to David, could never be induced to fight against their brethren of the northern tribes.

It must be understood that Sheba is the leader of all the northern tribes of the Israelites, and that it was a general rebellion. For it is recorded the Philistines went through *all the tribes* of Israel unto Abel, which they besieged. "And they cast up a bank against the city, and it stood

II Samuel xx. 14.

in a trench: and all the people that were with Joab battered the wall, to throw it down." This proves that it was one of the strong Israelite fortresses, and that it apparently resisted the attack, but traitors within murdered Sheba and cast his head over the wall. "And Joab returned to Jerusalem, and Benaiah was over the Cherethites and over the Pelethites." The Philistine troops had clearly crushed the rebellion.

II. Samuel xxi. 15.

In the following we can detect the palpable distortions of the Hebrew writers: "Moreover the Philistines had yet another war again with Israel." This is only natural, but what follows? "And David went down, and his servants with him, and fought against the Philistines."

Probably this is based upon truth, for David, as king of the Philistines and the Israelites, would be certain at times to clash with both parties, and would be called upon to put down Philistine revolts as well as Israelite rebellions, but it insidiously leads us to infer that David was fighting on the side of the Israelites.

It becomes apparent that the writers discovered that they had too freely exposed David as a Philistine, and a few records had therefore to be added to counteract the impression.

We are told that when David was the simple shepherd, he destroyed the mighty Philistine warrior Goliath, "whose height was six cubits and a span, and he had on an helmet of brass upon his head, and he was armed with a coat of mail, and the weight of the coat was five thousand shekels of brass, and the staff of his spear was like a weaver's beam, and his spear's head weighed six hundred shekels of iron, and one bearing a shield went before him." The object of this fantastic narrative is clear; it was inserted to lead us to infer that David was not a Philistine. *I. Samuel xvii.*

Many other similar subtle contrivances are adopted to lead us astray. But the story of the giant was thought most effective; so, at the end of his career, he only narrowly escapes from another gigantic warrior, and we are told four of them fall by the hand of David and by the hand of his servants. *I Samuel xviii. 25.*

But let us not be deceived, David was the king of the Philistines, and only secured his position as king of the Israelites by the aid of his Philistine forces, which also enabled him to rule an empire from the Euphrates to the Nile, and probably Egypt.

II. Samuel viii.

It will be noticed that the Philistines are very pointedly alluded to as uncircumcised. I submit this is one of the glaring distortions of priestcraft; for I must contend that the Philistines did adopt this Egyptian rite and the Israelites did not.

Herodotus xi. 104.

The Philistine Jewish prisoners of war which returned from captivity under Zerubbabel a prince of the house of David, were circumcised, which must conclusively prove they were not Israelites.

The writers clearly detected this, so they could only overcome the difficulty by insinuating that the Philistines were not circumcised.

I must also contend that the Israelites did not follow the Mosaic doctrine. The Mosaic doctrine was undoubtedly the creed of the Hyksos, Philistine Jews, who conquered the country from the Israelites.

Let us recall how David became king over the Israelites.

It was the result of the battle of Gilboa, where the Philistines had signally defeated the Israelites, and the Israelites had escaped over the River Jordan and left the country : "Then came *all the tribes* of Israel to David unto Hebron, and spake, saying, Behold, we are thy bone and thy flesh. So all the elders of Israel came to Hebron, and *King David* made a league with them, and they anointed David king over Israel." David, therefore, was king before the elders of Israel arrived to offer their submission. Undoubtedly he was king of the Philistines.

I. Samuel xxxi. 7.

II. Samuel v. 1.

It was vital to the design of the Biblical writers that the Philistines should be obscured ; grave suspicions must, therefore, rise in our minds whether the Israelite tribe of Judah held any power in Judea.

It could scarcely be credited that the Philistines should have permitted a strong section of their enemies within their lines to occupy positions of high influence even within their fortress of Jerusalem.

The Jews were undoubtedly a separate race to the Israelites, there are therefore strong grounds for conjecturing that the people of Judea were Jews and Philistines, and the tribe of Judah has only been presented to us as Israelite to obscure the Philistine power, and lead us to infer that the Philistine Jews were Israelities.

Genesis xxiii. Abimelech, a very early Philistine king, ruled in Hebron, which dominates all Judea, so the Philistines must have held Judea at that early period ; and as the possessors of a country acquire their name from their country, the Philistines would be called Jews.

It is recorded that the slaves expelled from Egypt entered Palestine by the east, in order to avoid Judea and the Philistines, and conquered the whole country. But I have shown that the Philistines were never dislodged from the time of their retreat from Egypt, so the Hebrew slaves could not have conquered Judea. Is it not inconsistent with reason to believe that the Egyptians would have permitted their runaway slaves to occupy the gate of their empire ?

We might easily presume that the Hyksos Philistines, the Israelites, and the Hebrews were in remote times called Israelites, after a renowned king bearing the name of Israel; but time separates nations, and they become split up into distinct families, just as the English have a common Scandinavian origin, but are now distinct from the Danes or the Germans; hence it becomes apparent great confusion must result by referring to the Jews as Israelites. It is clear that the Jews had become a distinct nation, and were in constant conflict with the Israelites.

Josephus. Note p. 499.

It has been the aim of the Biblical historians to confuse them together. The plot is superbly designed, but it falls to pieces the moment we detect that they were distinct and hostile races.

David was the king of the Philistine Jews, and Saul was king of the Israelites.

It is clear that David holds his own, and the Israelites are put down with a firm hand. This is explained in a psalm of thanksgiving.

II. Samuel xxii. 1.

"And David spake unto the Lord the

words of this song in the day that the Lord had delivered him out of the hand of *Saul*."

Psalm lxxii.

David is still the supreme monarch from the Euphrates to the river of Egypt. This is plainly indicated in David's last psalm, entitled "A Psalm for Solomon." "Give the king thy judgments, O God, and thy righteousness unto the king's son. He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him; and his enemies shall lick the dust. The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents: the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him. His name shall endure for ever: his name shall be continued as long as the sun: and men shall be blessed in him: all nations shall call him blessed."

Does this personify a king over a small community of Hebrew slaves?

It must be admitted that the Arabs are the true descendants of Abraham, and should

certainly be the chief custodians of Abrahamic lore.

If the reader will glance through the Koran, he will find David and Suleiman are depicted as their kings of kings with almost a universal empire.

David was not a petty king of Judea, but the monarch of an eastern empire.

CHAPTER VI.

I. Kings 2. By David's advice, Solomon, on ascending his throne, murders all competitors, and the kingdom was established in the hand of Solomon.

Solomon was not a warrior, and he appears to have lost the influence acquired by David without striking a blow, and to have patched up a peace with Egypt by marrying one of the Pharaohs' daughters. But still he ruled over a vast empire from the Euphrates to the border of Egypt at the beginning of his reign. This is recorded by the Biblical writers, but, as usual, it is distorted to support their design and obscure the source of Solomon's real power. "And Solomon reigned over all the kingdoms from the river (Euphrates) *unto the land of the Philistines*, and unto the border of Egypt; they brought presents, and served Solomon all the days of his life."

I. Kings iii. 1.

I. Kings iv. 21.

I will point out that Adonijah, now

David's eldest son, disputed the succession with Solomon: "And Adonijah feared because of Solomon, and arose, and went, and caught hold of the horns of the altar." Here then we have one of many distinct indications that the altar was adorned with ram's horns, the undoubted symbol of Amen-Ra. "So Zadoc, the priest, and Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada, and the *Cherethites* and the *Pelethites*, went down and caused Solomon to ride upon King David's mule, and brought him to Gibeon. And Zadoc anointed Solomon, and they blew the trumpet, and all the people said, God save King Solomon."

I. Kings i. 50.

I. Kings i. 38.

It becomes clear, then, that Solomon was surrounded by his Philistine troops at his coronation. Are we not forced to conclude that Solomon was the Philistine king?

The Philistines were the mortal enemies of the Israelites, how then could Solomon, if he were an Israelite be surrounded by Philistine forces?

The design of the Hebrew writers is manifest; they wish us to accept that Solomon was an Israelite king. And as

they have endeavoured to insinuate that the Hebrews were Israelites, we have Solomon before us apparently as a Hebrew king.

I. Kings iv. 21.

We can now understand the craft of the record I have quoted, where it is stated "Solomon reigned over all kingdoms from the Euphrates *unto the land of the Philistines*," for it insidiously leads us to infer that he did not rule over the land of the Philistines. But if he must depend on the Philistines to secure his throne, it shows that the Philistines were the source of his power.

Under the circumstances, considering that the Philistines had been in deadly feud with the Israelites for centuries, it is impossible to credit that they would be the factors in placing an Israelite on their throne. It stands to reason that if Solomon was emperor from the Euphrates to the border of Egypt he would have swept the Philistines into the sea if they were antagonistic to him. We may therefore be certain that the Philistine strongholds on the sea coast and Jerusalem were the backbone of Solomon's power, and that Solomon was the Philistine king.

Solomon would appear a monarch more given to pleasure than conquest, and we now find it recorded that his empire is contracting visibly. Emperors cannot recede from their conquests with impunity.

Solomon's kingdom is now alluded to from the entering in of Hamath to the river of Egypt, so we might conjecture that he still holds Tanis, the Zoan of the Bible. Unquestionably the river of Egypt refers to the Nile. *I. Kings viii. 65.*

David's kingdom extended to the Euphrates, but on his death Hadad rebels, and secures his independence in Edom. *II. Samuel viii. 3.*

Rezon founded another kingdom in Damascus, and he abhorred Israel, and reigned over Syria. *I. Kings xi. 25.*

Hadad and Rezon would probably be two of David's sons; the name Hadad being a compound of Dad (David): they would naturally be in conflict with the Israelites.

"And Solomon stood before the altar of the Lord in the presence of all the congregation of Israel, and he stood and blessed all the congregation." It is therefore clear *I. Kings x. 22, 55.*

Brugsch, vol. ii. 136.

that Solomon performed the functions of high priest; he was a descendant of Levi, the high priest of Amen.

At this time Pinotem, a descendant of Aphosis, was a priest of Amen and king in Egypt. They were both of the Hyksos royal family, in the line of Aphosis (*i.e.* Moses).

I must submit that this unquestionably connects Solomon with the line of the Hyksos kings, and as the Hyksos were, beyond a shadow of doubt, the Philistines, it becomes clear that Solomon was a Philistine king.

Psalm cxiv. 2.

Judea was his sanctuary, and Israel his dominion; in this we may detect a Philistine record.

See Edwin Johnson, Rise of Christendom, 196.

If we turn to the Koran, we shall find Solomon is alluded to as a monarch of great and universal power. He is presented to us in the poetical garb of Eastern fancy as endowed with supernatural powers. He had a carpet, 500 parasangs long, on which was placed 300 thrones of gold and silver. He would bid the wind to raise the carpet, with all that was on it; in the

morning he would be at Damascus, in the evening in Jerusalem, and the next day in the desert of Arabia. He went to Yemen—his route was by the Hedjaz, he arrives at Mecca, and predicts the coming of Mohammed. He visits and marries the Queen of Saba ; he converts her and all her army to the worship of Allah.

The transition from the Koran to the Biblical narrative is scarcely apparent unless it is pointed out.

"And King Solomon gave unto the queen of Sheba all her desire, whatsoever she asked, beside that which Solomon gave her of his royal bounty. Now the weight of gold that came to Solomon in one year was six hundred three score and six talents of gold, beside that he had of the merchantmen, and of the traffic of the spice merchants, and of all the kings of Arabia, and of the governors of the country. Moreover the king made a great throne of ivory, and overlaid it with best gold. And twelve lions stood there on the one side and on the other upon the six steps : there was not the like made in any kingdom. And all King

I. Kings x. 13.

Solomon's drinking vessels were of gold, none were silver : it was nothing accounted of in the days of Solomon. For the king had at sea a navy of Tharshish with the navy of Hiram, bringing gold, and silver, ivory, and apes, and peacocks. So King Solomon exceeded all the kings of the earth for riches and for wisdom. And all the earth sought Solomon to hear his wisdom, which God had put into his heart. He had a thousand and four hundred chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen. And Solomon had horses brought out of Egypt, and a chariot came up and went out of Egypt for six hundred shekels of silver, and an horse for an hundred and fifty. And so for all the kings of the *Hittites*, and for the kings of Syria."

We may, therefore, gather from the Koran and the Bible that Solomon was a powerful emperor. We can but inquire whether this was the monarch over a small nation and a comparatively small territory ?

It will be noticed Solomon supplied chariots for the kings of the Hittites ; let

us then turn back and see who the Hittites were, and we shall find that they clearly represent the Philistine race, that is, the children of Heth the Kheta or Hittites.

It will be remembered that when Abraham migrated from Ur of the Chaldeas, he sojourned in the Philistines' land many days. His wife Sarah died in Kirjath-arba, the same is Hebron, so Hebron was in the land of the Philistines. "And Abraham stood up before his dead, and spoke unto the sons of Heth, saying, I am a stranger, give me possession of a burying place, that I may bury my dead. And Abraham stood up and bowed himself to the people of the land, even to the children of Heth. And the children of Heth answered Abraham, Hear us, my lord; thou art a mighty prince among us; none of us shall withhold from thee his sepulchre. And Ephron the Hittite answered Abraham, saying, The field I give thee and the cave that is therein; and the field and the cave that is therein were made sure unto Abraham by the sons of Heth."

Genesis xxi. 34.

Genesis xxiii. 3.

It becomes clear that the Philistines were the children of Heth, that is, Hittites.

Brugsch, vol. i. 266.

Again, we gather from a tradition handed down by Julius Africanus, that the Hyksos were said to be Phœnicians, who took possession of Memphis and made the city of Avaris or Tanis their chief fortress; and as the Phœnicians are known as the Kheta or Hittites, there is another link to connect the Philistines with the Hittites.

Brugsch, when he tells us the Kheta occupied the exact boundaries of the twelve tribes of Israel, is an unbiassed witness, for the theory I am propounding was unknown to him; so we may safely conclude that the Philistines were Hyksos and Hittites, hence it follows when Solomon supplied chariots to the Hittite kings, they were for the tributary kings in his empire, which empire has been adroitly obscured in the Biblical narratives, no doubt with the view of leading us to infer that Solomon was a Hebrew king.

It will be conceded that the Jews built the Temple in Jerusalem:

I. Kings vi. 1.

"And it came to pass in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over

Israel, that he began to build the house of the Lord."

I must point this out as a most subtle and misleading record; it is founded on a basis of truth, the date given is probably authentic, and Solomon was king over Israel; but let us remember he was a Jewish king, and only king over Israel by conquest, and we are insidiously led to infer that the Israelites built the Temple. I have, however, endeavoured to explain that the Jews were the Hyksos, who under their King Aphosis (*i.e.* Moses) conquered Palestine from the Israelites. It becomes evident, then, that the Jews and the Israelites were two distinct and hostile nations, separated in customs, laws, religion, and probably language; hence the Israelites could not in any way have been associated with a Jewish Temple. The record therefore illustrates another glaring imposition on the part of the priestly writers.

It has been ascertained that this Temple was built by the Jews about 1017 B.C., so if we add the 480 years, mentioned in the record, which had elapsed since their retreat

from Egypt, we can date the exodus to about 1497 B.C. This is the precise date given by Sir Gardner Wilkinson for the reign of Thotmes III., who expelled the Hyksos from Egypt. Here, then, is another massive proof that the Jews were the Hyksos. Need I notice it was vital to the priestly design that this should be obscured?

I will further point out that if this view is a correct one, it entirely revolutionizes our present conception of Jewish and Israelite history.

CHAPTER VII

We have pointed out that Hadad, the king of Syria, and Rezon, the king of Damascus, recovered their kingdoms on the death of David. So Solomon's dominions would appear to be reduced to Palestine, that is, to the old kingdom conquered by the Hyksos Philistines under Aphosis (*i.e.* Moses). The very fact of the country acquiring the name of Palestine, or Philistia, is a solid proof it was held by the Philistines.

I. Kings xi. 23.

Zephaniah ii. 5.

It becomes clear that the voluptuary Solomon passed more time in his harem than in the camp.

I. Kings x 1.

The Pharaoh Shishak of the Assyrian royal family now ruled in Egypt; both Hadad and Rezon were probably his tributaries. And Jeroboam of the house of Saul is an honoured guest in his court.

40.

On the death of Solomon his son Rehoboam succeeds him. But Jeroboam leaves

43.

Egypt, and divides Palestine with Rehoboam.

The house of David is again face to face with the house of Saul and the power of Assyria, as recorded in the Abydus tablet.

I. Kings xiv. 25.

Rehoboam's kingdom is now reduced to Judea: "And it came to pass in the fifth year of king Rehoboam, that Shishak king of Egypt came up against Jerusalem: and he took away the treasures of the house of the Lord, and the treasures of the king's house; he even took away all."

This victory is recorded on the walls of the temple of Karnac in Thebes.

The Assyrian royal families now rule over the entire eastern empire from Nineveh to Thebes, about 976 B.C.

I now go back to point out how the priestly writers have imposed upon us.

I. Kings xii.

When Jeroboam divided the kingdom of Palestine with Rehoboam, it is recorded: "But as for the children of Israel which dwelt in the cities of Judah, Rehoboam reigned over them." Leaving us to infer that although Rehoboam might rule over the Israelites dwelling in his territory, yet

they were loyal to the house of Saul. Certainly this suggests some ghostly power behind Rehoboam, which is carefully obscured by the biblical writers, for if the Israelites are all united what is the position of Rehoboam, the king of the house of David? If he were an Israelite king, and only supported by Israelite troops, why did not the united Israelites depose him?

It will be remembered that in David's reign, during Absalom's rebellion, David was deserted by the twelve tribes of Israel. And I ventured to explain why he was not deposed. Simply because he was a Philistine king, and was supported by his Cherethite or Philistine forces, which enabled him to subdue the united Israelites.

And here we find Rehoboam in a precisely similar position; he is deserted by the twelve tribes of Israel, although he can control the single tribe of Judah, owing to its geographical position.

It is, however, recorded that there was war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam all the days of his life. How can this be

I. Kings xv. 6.

accounted for unless we admit either the tribe of Judah was at war with the northern Israelite tribes or that Rehoboam had some power behind him foreign to the tribe of Judah? Are we not forced to conclude that it was the same power commanded by David, viz. the Cherethite Philistines?

The war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam was a war between the Philistines and the Israelites; and the same powers are in conflict that assembled at Gilboa when Achish the Philistine king of Gath commanded the Philistines, and Saul commanded the Israelites, the Philistines being under the house of David and the Israelites, under the house of Saul.

As it is not my object to develop history, I will pass over some seventy years, during which time the two families of the house of David and the house of Saul are struggling together for supremacy.

Internecine warfare is bringing them both to the verge of destruction.

Ben-Hadad, the king of Syria, declares war against Ahab, the king of Israel: "And

the king of Israel went out, and smote the horses and chariots, and slew the Syrians with a great slaughter." *I. Kings xx. 21.*

The unhappy position of Israel on this occasion is alluded to in the Book of Isaiah: "And all the people shall know, even Ephraim and the inhabitants of Samaria, that say in the pride and stoutness of heart, the bricks are fallen down, but we will build with hewn stones: the sycamores are cut down, but we will change them into cedars; therefore the Lord shall set up the adversaries of Rezon against him, and join the enemies together, the Syrians before, and the *Philistines* behind; and they shall devour Israel with open mouth." *Isaiah ix. 9.*

Here the Philistines are distinctly pointed out as the power occupying Judea, behind the Israelites.

The Israelites appear to have grasped their unfortunate position and made peace with the Philistines. And we have it recorded that "Ahab the king of Israel, made a league with Jehoshaphat [the Philistine king] and they unite their forces and attack the Syrians." *I. Kings xxii. 4.*

The result of the war is not apparent, but Ahab meets with his death on the battle-field; Ahaziah his son succeeds him, and amicable relations continue between the houses of David and Saul, 899 B.C. But the feud seems to have broken out again in a few years, and they are again in open war with each other, and it is recorded that Joash the king of Israel engaged in conflict with Amaziah the king of Judah at Beth-Shemesh, where Judah was put to the worse before Israel, and Jerusalem is taken and sacked, 841 B.C.

II. Chronicles xxv. 24.

The following year Hazael went up and fought against Gath and took it, and only refrains from attacking Jerusalem by Jehoash stripping the temple of all its treasure and paying tribute to Hazael.

II. Kings xii. 17.

The glory of the Philistines is departing, constant war had exhausted them, and the king of Judea is forced to pay tribute to Hazael king of Syria. These successes of Hazael appear to have brought him into conflict with the great king.

Ibid. xiii. 3.

Shalmaneser invades Syria and inflicts upon him a severe defeat. Shalmaneser

must at this period have had practical command of the entire empire, 839 B.C.

The Assyrian dynasty of Shishak was still reigning in Egypt.

We now meet with a record where the subjects of the king of Judea are alluded to as Jews: "At that time Rezon king of Syria recovered Elath to Syria, and drove the *Jews* from Elath. So Ahaz the king of Judah sent messengers to his suzerain, Tiglath-pileser, the great king, and begged his assistance. And Ahaz took the silver and gold that was found in the house of the Lord, and in the treasures of the king's house, and sent it for a present to the king of Assyria. And the king of Assyria hearkened unto him: for the king of Assyria went up against Damascus, and took it, and carried the people of it away to Kir and slew Rezon. And king Ahaz went to Damascus to meet Tiglath-pileser, and saw an altar that was at Damascus: and king Ahaz sent to Urijah the priest the fashion of the altar. And Urijah the priest built an altar according to all that king Ahaz had sent from Damascus. And when the king

II. Kings xvi. 6.

II. Kings xvi. 8.

II. Kings 9.

was come from Damascus, he burnt his burnt offering and his meat offering upon the altar." We may therefore conclude that the worship of the Assyrians was in no way inconsistent with the worship in Jerusalem.

This need not surprise us, for we find Syria governed by kings whose names are compounded with "Dad," a symbol of the Osirian cult :—

II. Kings xvii. 1, 3.

"In the twelfth year of Ahaz king of Judah began Hoshea to reign in Samaria over Israel; against him came up Shalmaneser king of Assyria ; and Hoshea became his servant. And the king of Assyria found conspiracy in Hoshea: for he had sent messengers to So king of Egypt," 725 B.C.

The whole empire is now in a state of commotion ; Egypt as well as Syria is distracted with civil wars.

The Assyrian dynasty of Shishak has fallen in Egypt, the country is divided among rival petty kings.

It will be remembered that the twentieth Egyptian dynasty closed by the accession to power of the high priest of Amen, Hirhor, and the Ramessides were banished

to an oasis, and I traced Hirhor as a descendant of the Hyksos kings. After a glorious tenure of power, their dynasty was supplanted by the Assyrian royal family, and this time they retreated south, and acquired dominion in Ethiopia as independent kings, and from this date we find the Egyptian king's sons of Kush are struck out of the official list of court dignitaries, and the kings of Kush take their place. *Brugsch, vol. ii. 235.*

The Hyksos family are therefore now supreme in Ethiopia, in their royal city of Napata, but, let it be remembered, not Ethiopians. The Theban, Amen-Ra was still reverenced as the supreme god of the country.

As the power of the Assyrians dwindled through incessant warfare the power of the Hyksos in Ethiopia was increasing. Thebes fell under their dominion, and while the Assyrians regarded Lower Egypt as their permanent fief, the districts of Patoris were virtually an Ethiopian (Hyksos) province. Middle Egypt formed a march. The Hyksos are again the rulers of Thebes; and shortly after Sabaka, the "So" of

the Bible, assumes the double crown, and founds the twenty-fifth Egyptian dynasty. And, as we might have anticipated, we find that Hoshea, the king of Israel, is tributary to him.

II. i Kngs xvii. 4.

However, Sabaka is probably fully occupied in retaining his own position in Egypt, and is unable to control him, but we shall shortly find the struggle for supremacy in the empire is between the Assyrian royal family in Nineveh and the Hyksos royal family in Memphis, which convinces us that we are travelling on the true historical path.

I. Samuel xiii. 19.

We must remember that Achish, the Philistine king of Gath, was absolute master of Palestine before the accession of Saul to the throne of Israel; so we might conjecture that Achish's reign extended from about 1090 B.C. till he was succeeded by David about 1060, and I have pointed out that David's dominion embraced an empire from the Euphrates to the river of Egypt, and probably Egypt itself.

Solomon succeeded David about 1020 B.C., but before the close of his reign his power

had dwindled considerably, and his son Rehoboam only ruled over Judea.

It will be noticed then that the power of the Philistines in Palestine exactly coincides with the power of the so-called priest-kings of the twenty-first Egyptian dynasty.

This coincidence of rule between the power of the house of Achish and David in Palestine and the power of the priest-kings in Egypt is so important, that I venture to recall my arguments relating to the family connection between them.

It will be admitted that the office of high priest of Amen was strictly hereditary and far more enduring than the kingly office, for a usurping monarch chiefly secured his position through marriage with the divine heiress and by the influence of the priests.

So when the Hyksos, under their king Aphosis, were supplanted, the Hyksos high priest retained his position. This is abundantly shown by our finding a high priest of Amen of the name of Levi in the Pharaoh Mineptah's reign associated with the noble Phinehas. And we know that both Levi and Phinehas were descendants

of Moses (*i.e.* Aphosis), the Hyksos king of Egypt at the time of their retreat.

This in itself affords strong grounds for the belief that Aphosis, the Hyksos king, was identical with Moses.

But as I have shown that the Hyksos, called Philistines, retreated to Palestine and conquered the country, as described in the book of Joshua, our conjectures become certainties when we find that the high priest of the Philistine king Achish, is Ahiah, the son of Ahitub, Ichabod's brother, the son of Phinehas, both of them, as we know, related to Moses and Levi. And as Phinehas traces his descent through Aaron we may be almost certain that the true line of priests through Aphosis (*i.e.* Moses) remained as high priests in Egypt, and the family of Aaron supplied the high priests in Palestine. If my view, then, is a correct one, there can be no doubt that the temple in Jerusalem was dedicated to Amen-ra.

CHAPTER VIII.

Hezekiah must have ascended the throne of Judea about the same time that Sabaka assumed the double crown of Egypt.

We may readily conjecture that many innovations had crept into the temple worship at Jerusalem. And as the high priests of Amen were now in full power in Egypt they would naturally attempt to establish uniformity in their religious rites. This is strikingly confirmed, for we find Hezekiah engaged as a reformer. He removed the high places, and brake the images, and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made. Now these are precisely the reforms we might have anticipated, for they must have been innovations upon their old worship in Egypt. The plains of Egypt could hardly have developed a worship in high places; and the brazen serpent, we

II. Kings xviii. 4.

know, was introduced after the retreat from Egypt.

The reforms are also to be accounted for very plainly, for in the following verse we find it recorded that Hezekiah rebelled against the king of Assyria and served him not, and eradicated the Assyrian cult.

This admits us behind the scenes. For if Hezekiah rebelled against the king of Assyria it follows that he was a vassal to Assyria before the overthrow of the Assyrian power in Egypt by Sabaka, the Pharaoh of Egypt of the Hyksos line.

The struggle for supremacy over the empire is clearly defined between the royal family of the Hyksos and the royal family of Assyria, the Hyksos Philistines being supreme in Judea.

The writers must have grasped this fact, hence another Philistine Goliath must be slain.

II. Kings xviii. 8.

The next verse therefore informs us that Hezekiah smote the Philistines even unto Gaza and the borders thereof, from the tower of the watchmen to the fenced city.

But do not let us be deceived, Hezekiah was the king of the Philistines.

As the Biblical narratives are invariably based on authentic records we may conclude this attack on the Philistines refers to some revolt of one of the petty kings.

The record, however, adroitly leads us to infer that King Hezekiah was no Philistine, which insinuation is vital to the Biblical plot.

The Assyrians under Shalmaneser are all-powerful; Tyre is besieged, and Samaria blockaded. During the siege Shalmaneser dies and is succeeded by Sargon, who captures Samaria, and sends the principal Israelite families into captivity.

We might well view the provinces of Judea and Israel as buffer states between the powers of Egypt and Assyria, Judea being dependent on Egypt and Israel on Assyria. It is clear that Israel had been coquetting with Egypt, and had met with severe chastisement; their king was deposed and the country occupied and ruled by an Assyrian garrison. Isaiah now becomes the national leader of the Israelites, and Heze-

II. Kings xvii. 4.

kiah endeavours to secure their allegiance; a common danger from Assyria would unite them.

II. Chronicles xxx. 1.

"And Hezekiah sent to all Israel *and Judah*, and wrote letters to Ephraim and Manasseh, that they should come to the Lord at Jerusalem, to keep the passover; and there assembled at Jerusalem much people, and the king of Judah did give to the congregation a thousand bullocks and seven thousand sheep. So there was great joy in Jerusalem, for since the time of Solomon, the son of David, king of Israel, there was not the like in Jerusalem." Hence we may gather, that Hezekiah had won over the Israelites after their crushing defeat and loss of independence, which would explain the great rejoicing in Jerusalem; the twelve Israelite tribes were again united under the house of David. The house of Saul had been taken into captivity with perhaps the exception of Isaiah, probably a royal priest and loyal to Assyria.

Isaiah xiv. 29.

Such a demonstration rouses the indignation of Isaiah, and he prophesies against Hezekiah: "Rejoice not thou, whole Palestina,

because the rod of him that smote thee is broken : Howl, O gate ; cry, O city ; thou, whole Palestina, art dissolved : for there shall come from the north a smoke, and none shall be alone in his appointed times."

Can there be a doubt that Isaiah is prophesying against the Philistines, and their king Hezekiah ?

The prophecy explains itself. The Israelites, the rival family of the Philistines, have been crushed ; this would greatly consolidate Hezekiah's power, and the Philistines were rejoicing over the event.

Isaiah, like a wise politician, foresaw the result, and warned them that their own destruction would follow.

The Assyrian invasion of Judea is attributed by the Biblical writers to Sennacherib; but Assyrian inscriptions prove that this is incorrect. The expedition was conducted by Sargon.

This is sufficient to convince us that the Biblical narratives were compiled long after the events recorded, so long that the historians were in utter confusion with regard to the reigning kings; so the narratives are

Professor Sayce, Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments, p. 112.

not diaries of the contemporary events as suggested.

Another power, hoping to reap advantage from the Assyrian exhaustive wars, now appears on the scene. Hezekiah is solicited to join in a confederacy against Assyria. But Sargon promptly invades Judea and captures Hezekiah's strong fortress of Ashdod, which was evidently garrisoned by Egyptian forces, 711 B.C.

II. Chronicles xxxii. 31.

Isaiah xx. 1.

Sargon is now murdered and is succeeded by Sennacherib, 705 B.C.: "And Sennacherib, king of Assyria, came up against all the fenced cities of Judah;" so now we shall be able to discover which are the King of Judah's strongholds They have been adroitly obscured by the Biblical historians.

II. Kings xviii. 13.

I have already pointed out that the Philistines are referred to in the Biblical records as the children of Heth, that is Hittites. The Egyptian monuments also refer to them as the Kheta or Hittites.

This is also confirmed by the Assyrian inscriptions, for the expedition of Sennacherib against Judea is said to be directed

G. Smith, Assyrian Eponym, canon 131.

against the Hittites and Philistia. Could any stronger evidence be adduced that the expedition was directed against the Philistines?

The historians tell us that the Hebrews had no family connection with the Hittites, and if we are to rely on the Biblical records, the Hebrews had been supreme in Palestine for many centuries. How then can we account for the Hebrews not being alluded to in any single Assyrian or Egyptian record?

At this period Zedekiah, a name associated with the royal house of David, was King of Ashkelon, one of the Philistine strongholds on the sea coast.

I am indebted to Professor Sayce for the translation of Sennacherib's cylinder: "Zedekiah, King of Ashkelon [says Sennacherib], who had not submitted to my yoke himself, the gods of the house of his fathers, his wife, his sons, his daughters, and his brothers, I removed, and I sent him to Assyria. In the course of my campaign I captured Beth-Dagon, Joppa, Benebarak, and Azur, *the cities of Zedekiah*, which did not submit at once to my yoke, and I carried

Fresh Lights from the Ancient Monuments, 114.

away their spoil. The priests, the chief men, and the common people of Ekron, who had thrown into chains their king Padi, because he was faithful to his oath to Assyria, and had given him up to Hezekiah, feared in their hearts. The King of Egypt, the bowmen, the chariots, and the horses of the King of Ethiopia had gathered together innumerable forces, and gone to their assistance. In sight of the town of Eltekah was their order of battle drawn up. Trusting to Assur, my Lord, I fought with them, and overthrew them. I captured the towns of Eltekah and Timnath. I marched against the city of Ekron, and put to death the priests and the chief men, and I hung up their bodies on stakes all round the city. I had Padi, their king, brought out from the midst of Jerusalem, and I seated him on the throne of royalty; but as for Hezekiah of Judah, who had not snbmitted to my yoke, forty-six of his strong cities I captured. I brought from the midst of them and counted as a spoil 200,150 persons. Hezekiah himself I shut up like a bird in a cage in Jerusalem, his royal city. I cut off *his*

cities and gave them to Metinti, King of Ashdod, Padi, King of Ekron, and Zib-Baal, King of Gaza, and I made *his country* small."

As these are all Philistine fortresses, are we not forced to the conclusion that Hezekiah was the Philistine king?

It might be contended that Hezekiah had subdued the Philistines and occupied their country. In this case they must have been annihilated, for no mention whatever is made of them. How could we then account for Isaiah's prophecy against the Philistines, and whole Palestina? But I have shown clearly they were the dominant power in Judea.

I have demonstrated that a section of the family of Jacob, that is the Hebrew slaves, did not leave Egypt till after the Philistines had firmly established themselves in Palestine; it therefore becomes clear the Hebrew slaves, as an isolated family, did not acquire any kind of supremacy in Palestine; and I have pointed out allusions to them which must convince us they were reduced to comparative slavery among the Philistines and Israelites. *Jeremiah xxxiv. 9.*

I do not for a moment contend that the

Israelites were not of the family of Jacob; not a doubt they were, but they were the descendants of Jacob left in Palestine when the expedition of Jacob's family left to try their fortunes in Egypt.

I must, however, earnestly contend that the remnants of the expedition which returned as slaves and acquired the name of Hebrews became an isolated class after their long sojourn in Egypt, and remained so for centuries ; for we find them an isolated community during the Roman occupation of the empire.

It is only priestcraft that has brought them into notice, for upon this isolated and special community is based a far-reaching priestly cult, which claims a Divine right for universal dominion, through a supposed Divine promise given to their ancestor Jacob, though narrowed into the Hebrews.

All the complications may be traced to this priestly cult, being founded on the isolated community of Hebrews ; for it became vital to the design that the Hebrews should appear in possession of their promised land, and this was never realised.

The authentic records had therefore to be twisted and garbled to support the plot.

We may assure ourselves that the royal families within the great Eastern Empire were closely related to each other, and the wars were occasioned by individual families struggling for supremacy.

We left Hezekiah besieged in Jerusalem; Sennacherib had devastated his country and defeated the Egyptian forces sent to relieve him; but the Pharaoh, encouraged by his courageous defence of Jerusalem, makes another great effort to succour him. The Assyrian Rab-Shakeh has delivered his ultimatum. *II. Kings xviii.*

Hezekiah in his distress sends to Isaiah, the chief of the Israelites, and craves his assistance. Isaiah is in gloomy retirement in his own country of Israel. He had prophesied against the Philistines; all his sympathies were antagonistic to Hezekiah. *Isaiah xiv. 29.*

Hezekiah's father, Ahaz, had brought about all his trouble by calling in the Assyrians. Although bent, Isaiah was not broken; he sends back a haughty message to Hezekiah. *II. Kings xvi. 9.*

Isaiah is now a vassal of Assyria, and would be intimately acquainted with all the

Assyrian policy. He tells Hezekiah that the Assyrians will retire; he evidently knew the Egyptian forces were approaching:

II. Kings xix. 35. "And it came to pass that night, that the angel of the Lord went out, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians an hundred fourscore and five thousand: and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses."

Might we not hazard a conjecture that the Pharaoh of Egypt had engaged the Assyrian forces and almost annihilated them.

Tirhakah, the Hyksos Pharaoh, must now have been supreme from Jerusalem to Napata; he has divided the great empire with Sennacherib. Their watch dogs bark across the boundaries of Judea and Israel.

We gather from the Biblical records that Sennacherib after his reverses retired to Nineveh: "So Sennacherib, king of Assyria, departed, and dwelt at Nineveh," 701 B.C. And in the next verse we read:

II. Kings xix. 36, 37. "And it came to pass that as he was worshipping in the house of Nisroch his god, his sons smote him with the sword, and Esarhaddon his son reigned in his stead."

This event took place in 681 B.C., thus twenty years had elapsed since his invasion of Palestine.

The Egyptian Pharaoh appears to have been left in peace so far as his Assyrian rivals were concerned.

Sennacherib is succeeded by Assur-ebil-ili-kain, but is shortly deposed by Esar-haddon, 681 B.C.

Esarhaddon in the following year invades Palestine, and puts Manasseh, the King of Judah, under tribute, and six years after he attacks Tirhakah and drives him out of Egypt.

Esarhaddon now, is supreme from Nineveh to Thebes, and Egypt is divided into twenty separate kingdoms. In 669 B.C. Tirhakah reconquers the country, but is again expelled, and Egypt is devastated by contending armies.

Tirhakah dies in 667 B.C., and he is succeeded by Undamane, but is shortly expelled by Assurpanipal, who was now King of Nineveh.

Psamethik succeeds in acquiring supremacy among the petty kings, and assumes the crown of Egypt.

Brugsch tells us that his name belonged to the Ethiopic family [that is the Hyksos], to which he most probably owed his success, so we may still follow him as a descendant of the Hyksos kings. Their glory is fast fading away, but with Psamethik, whose name signifies "Son of the Sun," the sun of prosperity shines upon Egypt.

Brugsch, vol. ii. 285. vol. i. 273.

Although Brugsch tells us that the name of Psamethik belonged to the Ethiopic [Hyksos] language, and that its signification was "Son of the Sun," and although he also points out that the Hyksos king Nubti had an official name of Set-a-pehti, it would appear he did not realise its full significance in connecting Psamethik with the Hyksos family.

The reader will, however, notice if we can undoubtedly connect Psamethik, the Pharaoh of the 26th Egyptian Dynasty, with the Hyksos, it again brings the Hyksos into view, and reveals a most interesting episode in Egyptian history; and I must surmise that the name Psamethik is probably a corruption of Set-a-pehti, both names signifying "Son of the Sun."

CHAPTER IX.

I HAVE pointed out that it was vital to the design of the priestly writers to show that the single family of Jacob, as represented in the Hebrew slaves which escaped from Egypt, should appear as the possessors of the promised land. It was also necessary that they should appear as a peculiar people under the special guidance of the Almighty; of this there can be no doubt, if we can credit the priestly narratives. They escape from servitude amid portentous signs and wonders; they exist in deserts by miraculous sustenance; they are guided personally by their God, who, amid the thunders of Sinai, delivers to them their laws; they conquer their enemies through supernatural assistance, and like a whirlwind sweep over their promised land, destroying every soul that breathed, and found, on the ashes of idolatry, a worship of the one true God,

Joshua x. 40.

who becomes the centre of a priestly cult. I have, however, demonstrated that this conquest of their promised land could not have been realised, for the Philistines were in possession of Judea and Palestine before the Hebrews left Egypt, and the Philistines were never dislodged.

Exodus xiii. 17.

It therefore becomes apparent there must have been two exoduses from Egypt ; one the retreat of the Hyksos Jews, the other the expulsion of the Israelite slaves, and the Biblical writers have confused them together.

Although it is recorded that the Hebrews fell away to idolatry, still, if we credit the Biblical records, we are led to understand that the temple of Solomon in Jerusalem was dedicated, in accordance with the Hebrew doctrine, to the exclusion of all other priestly cults.

Let us now endeavour to trace whether the worship conducted in this temple was consistent with a creed, as indicated in the *priestly version* of the books of Moses.

We may reasonably conjecture that Aphosis (*i.e.* Moses) did draw up a code of worship for the guidance of his colony in

Judea, but we may be certain that it was based on the old Hyksos cult, the worship of Amen-Ra, and had but little sympathy with Hebrew worship; and it becomes apparent that it has been distorted in order to frame an entirely different system of priestcraft.

"Josiah was eight years old when he began to reign, and he did that which was right in the sight of the Lord." *II. Kings xxii.*

In the records relating to the kings of Judea we may invariably trace the influence of the orthodox priests of Egypt when they did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, and the influence of Assyria when they did that which was evil.

The Hyksos family are now in power in Egypt: "And Hilkiah the high priest said unto Shaphan the scribe, I have found the book of the law in the house of the Lord. And it came to pass when the king had heard the words of the book of the law, that he rent his clothes. And the king commanded Hilkiah the priest, Go ye, enquire of the Lord for me, and for the people, and for all Judah, for great is the wrath of the Lord

that is kindled against us, because our fathers have not hearkened unto the words of this book. And the king commanded Hilkiah the high priest to bring forth out of the temple of the Lord all the vessels that were made for Baal, and for the grove, and for all the host of heaven. And he put down the idolatrous priests, whom the kings of Judah had ordained to burn incense in the high places. Them also that burned incense unto Baal, to the sun, and to the moon, and to the planets, and to all the hosts of heaven. And he brought out the grove from the house of the Lord, without Jerusalem, unto the brook Kidron, and burnt it there, and he brought all the priests out of the cities of Judah, and defiled the high places. And he defiled Topheth, that no man might make his son or his daughter to pass through the fire to Molech. And he took away the horses that the kings of Judah had given to the sun, and burned the chariots of the sun with fire. And the altars which the kings of Judah had made, and which Manasseh had made, and the high places that were before Jersualem, which were on the right

hand of the mount of corruption, which Solomon had builded for Ashtoreth the abomination of the Zidonians, and for Chemosh the abomination of the Moabites, and for Milcom the abomination of the children of Ammon, did the king defile; and he slew all the priests of the high places that were there on the altars, and burned men's bones upon them, and returned to Jerusalem. And the king commanded all the people, saying, Keep the passover. Surely there was not holden such a passover from the days of the judges that judged Israel, nor in all the days of the kings of Israel, nor of the kings of Judea."

See also Joseph Jacob's articles on the Nethinim in the Babylonian and Oriental Record, vol. ii. pp. 66 and 100.

Here then we are initiated into the worship conducted in the temple of Jerusalem since its establishment by Solomon. Thus, if we conceive them to be Hebrews, all the prayers and pious thanksgivings we have listened to from this special and peculiarly sacred people have been addressed to false gods.

Where was the niche in this temple for the two stone tablets said to have been written by the finger of the Almighty?

Exodus xx.

"Thou shalt have no other gods before me.

"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth.

"Thou shalt not bow down to them thyself, nor serve them."

It therefore becomes clear that such a creed was not preached in the Temple of Jerusalem.

If my conjecture be correct, and Moses represents King Aphosis of the 17th Egyptian dynasty, who led the Hyksos into Palestine, then we should find a community of laws prevailing in Egypt and Palestine, though we might expect it to be distorted by innovations.

Professor Huxley, Evolution of Theology.

Pofessor Huxley tells us that the Biblical Ten Commandments, as far as the moral laws are concerned, are almost identical with the Egyptian Ten Words, and follow each other in a similar rotation.

Egyptian.	Jewish.
3rd. I have not blasphemed.	3rd. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.
5th. I have not reviled my Father.	5th. Honour thy Father.
6th. I have not murdered.	6th. Thou shalt do no murder.
7th. I have not committed adultery.	7th. Thou shalt not commit adultery.
8th. I have not stolen.	8th. Thou shalt not steal.
9th. I have not told falsehood in the tribunal of truth.	9th. Thou shalt not bear false witness.

Hence it becomes apparent that the Jewish laws were derived from the Egyptian code, and it solidly confirms our conjecture that Aphosis (*i.e.* Moses) instituted them.

We may further conclude that the worship and laws of the Israelites were framed on an entirely different system. It is remarkable we have no record of the Passover being kept in Israel.

The worship of the Supreme, being the basis of all religions, it matters little how the Almighty is symbolised, or under which name he is worshipped :

Edwin Johnson, Antiqua Mater, 133.

"The virtuous and reverent of every nation follow one religion and one moral code, and may reduce their vital creed to a few short and simple forms.

"It is a vital creed that is before us. The way of life is this: first, thou shalt love God who made thee. Second, thy neighbour as thyself. And all things whatsoever thou wouldst not should be done to thee, neither do thou to another."

Brugsch's Egypt, vol. i. p. 112.

A record worthy of remembrance is preserved in an old manuscript on papyrus, dating back to the fourth millennium B.C.: "It does the heart good, and refreshes the mind, to follow that ancient discourse which unfolds the deepest thoughts of the venerable prince in simple, childlike words. Its teaching is noble as to the true greatness of man, for it is penetrated by the gentle spirit of human purity."

Patah-hotep speaks thus: "And if thou hast become great, after thou hast been lowly, and if thou hast amassed riches after poverty, so that thou hast become because of this the first in thy city; and if the people know thee on account of thy wealth and

thou art become a mighty lord, let not thy heart be lifted up because of thy riches, for the author of them is God. Despise not thy neighbour, who is as thou wast; but treat him as thy equal."

Has modern priestcraft developed a purer doctrine?

CHAPTER X.

We have seen that during the reign of Josiah, King of Judah, great religious reforms took place in Jerusalem. The priests of Amen were in full power in Egypt, hence uniformity of worship would be insisted on. The people of Judea had adopted the Kheta god, Sutekh or Set, referred to as Baal in the priestly narratives. This was violently opposed by the orthodox priests of Amen, and in these priests we may detect the fire-brand prophets of the Biblical records, which is not the least interesting feature in the problem.

During the Pharaoh Psamethik's long reign he had doubtless to contend against the power of Assyria; but Assyria was hastening to her fall, her eastern enemies occupied her whole attention, and the Western Empire had comparative peace.

The Pharaoh Necho succeeded Psamethik

and now ascended the throne of Egypt, and at the close of Josiah's reign in Judea Pharaoh Necho, king of Egypt, went up against the king of Assyria to the river Euphrates; so he must have been master of Palestine. *II. Kings xxiii. 29.*

The Chaldeans were again fast coming into power, and at their hands, at Carchemesh, which guarded the fords of the Euphrates, Necho met his defeat, 605 B.C., only one year after the fall of the Assyrian power in Nineveh.

On the Pharaoh's return to Palestine, he deposes Jehoahaz, who had succeeded Josiah, and places his brother Jehoikim on the throne. The Chaldean forces soon follow, and we gather from the records that Nebuchadnezzar captured Jerusalem and took the people into captivity: "None remained save the poorest sort of the people of the land." *II. Kings xxiii. 34.* *xxiv. 14*

I must venture to conjecture that this is a priestly distortion; but do not let us be deceived, the old Philistine power in Jerusalem is still strong enough to defy the armies of Babylon, and also the Israelites, who are supporting Nebuchadnezzar.

II. Kings xxiv. 17.

Zedekiah is said to have been make king by Nebuchadnezzar, but shortly afterwards we are told that Zedekiah rebelled against the king of Babylon.

As I am only glancing over historical events, I must remind the reader that some one hundred and twenty years have elapsed since the fall of the Israelite kingdom of Samaria. At that time Isaiah, the then leader of the Israelites, had predicted the fall of Jerusalem and the Philistine nation.

Jeremiah xiv. 29.

I must submit that Isaiah's prophecy forces us to conclude that the Philistines were supreme in Judea.

It will be remembered that in Hezekiah's reign all the Philistine fortresses were under the dominion of Hezekiah, and if Hezekiah were not the Philistine king, the Philistines must have been somehow annihilated. The design of the priestly writers is to lead us to infer this, for it is clear that the Hebrews were not the Philistines, and therefore the Philistines must be obscured in order to make it appear that the Hebrews were in possession of their promised land.

But I contend that the Jewish nation led by the house of David were the Philistines. And they were always in conflict with the Israelites, who followed the house of Saul. And we find them now, still under the house of David, holding Jerusalem against the Chaldeans; and the Israelites under Jeremiah are in open revolt, having gone over to the Chaldeans.

Jeremiah, the national chief of the Israelites, was thundering his anathemas against the Jewish king. *Jeremiah xvii.*

Zedekiah now throws off his allegiance to Nebuchadnezzar, and, as we might surmise, puts Jeremiah into prison, which distinctly proves that the Israelites were under subjection to Zedekiah, the king of the Philistine Jews: "Now Pashur, the high priest, who was also governor in the house of the Lord, heard that Jeremiah prophecied these things. Then Pashur smote Jeremiah and put him in the stocks."

Now, if none remained in Jerusalem save "the poorest sort of the people of the land," how is Zedekiah enabled to take Jeremiah, the chief of the Israelites, and put him in *II. Kings xxiv. 14.*

prison? Still, Jeremiah is a personage of considerable importance; he is under the protection of the Chaldeans. So Zedekiah sends Pashur to Jeremiah, who is in prison, and inquires if Nebuchadnezzar cannot be induced to raise the siege. Jeremiah tells him that the only policy he can adopt is to give up the town and says: "He that abideth in this city shall die by the sword, but he that goeth out and falleth to the Chaldeans that besiege you, shall live."

Jeremiah xxi. 1.

Jeremiah xxi. 9.

This is clearly the ultimatum of Nebuchadnezzar to the Philistine Jewish king.

The Egyptian forces, however, appear on the scene, and raise the siege: "And it came to pass that when the army of the Chaldeans was broken up from Jerusalem for fear of the Pharaoh's army, then Jeremiah went forth out of Jerusalem to go into the land of Benjamin," his own country of Israel.

xxxvii. 11.

He is again charged with falling away to the Chaldeans; "wherefore the princes were wroth with Jeremiah and smote him, and put him in prison," and as he continues plotting he is confined in a dungeon.

Zedekiah has a private interview with him: "Then said Jeremiah unto Zedekiah: If thou wilt go forth unto the king of Babylon thy soul shall live, but if thou wilt not go forth, then shall this city be given into the hand of the Chaldeans. And Zedekiah the king said unto Jeremiah, *I am afraid of the Jews* that are fallen to the Chaldeans lest they deliver me into their hands, and they mock me. And Jeremiah said they shall not deliver thee." *Jeremiah xxxviii. 17.*

Let us clearly understand that Jeremiah was the leader of the Israelites, who followed the house of Saul, the old enemies of the house of David.

Now if Zedekiah said that he was afraid of the Jews, it is clear he alluded to the Israelites of the tribe of Judah, who were in quasi revolt. So these Jews must certainly refer to the tribe of Judah, who might be called Jews, owing to their residence in Judea. It is one of the subtle combinations in the plot.

Here then we find Zedekiah in precisely the same position we found David during the rebellion of Absalom; and in precisely

the same position as we found Rehoboam after the division of the country into separate kingdoms.

David was deserted by the tribe of Judah.

I. Kings xii. 24. Rehoboam was also deserted by the tribe of Judah, or, to be strictly correct, the tribe of Judah refused to support him in endeavouring to put down the Israelite revolt.

And here again we find Zedekiah afraid the tribe of Judah may revolt.

II. Samuel. xviii. I have pointed out that David, during Absalom's rebellion, succeeded in crushing the revolt of the united twelve tribes of Israel. The tribe of Judah was said to be the leader; it is apparent then that David was not supported by any one of the Israelite families. But as David signally defeated the united Israelite revolt, he must have had some power behind him. It will be remembered that David succeeded Achish, the Philistine king of Gath, after the battle of Gilboa, where the Israelites were routed by the Philistines, and had escaped out of the country.

I. Samuel xxxi. 7.

David was at this time a general in the

Philistine camp. It stands to reason then that David was put on the throne by the Philistines, and this is abundantly confirmed, for we find David crushed the revolt of the twelve tribes of the Israelites during Absalom's rebellion solely by the aid of the Cherethite or Philistine troops. It therefore becomes clear David was the king of the Philistines.

I. Samuel xxvii. 6.

II. Samuel xv. 18.

Now let us turn to the revolt of the Israelites under Jeroboam.

On the death of Solomon eleven of the Israelite tribes deserted Rehoboam, Solomon's son, and the Israelite tribe of Judah refused to support him in putting down the rebellion. So Rehoboam was practically deserted by the twelve Israelite tribes.

We are told there was war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam all their days. So Rehoboam must have had some power behind him foreign to the Israelites to enable him to carry on the war.

I. Kings xv. 6.

Can it be doubted which this power was? It must have been the same power that supported David under similar circumstances, viz. the Cherethite or Philistine forces.

And now we come to Zedekiah; he is deserted by the eleven tribes of the Israelites under Jeremiah, and he is fearful the tribe of Judah will betray him. He not only restrains the tribe of Judah, but he puts the leader of the eleven Israelite tribes in prison, and defies the Chaldean power. What power then enabled him to accomplish this? May we not be certain that he had behind him the same power which supported David and Rehoboam under similar circumstances, viz. the Cherethites or Philistines?

We have been led astray in supposing the Philistine power to have been exhausted; they were still dominant in Jerusalem and in their strongholds on the sea coast, and Zedekiah was their king. We are left to understand that Zedekiah was the Philistine king at bay against the Chaldeans, and that he could calculate on no support from the twelve tribes of Israel, who under Jeremiah had fallen away to the Chaldeans: "And in the ninth year of Zedekiah king of Judah, came Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon and all his army against Jerusalem, and they besieged it. And in the eleventh year of

Jeremiah xxxix. 1.

Zedekiah the city was broken up. And all the princes of the king of Babylon came in, and sat in the middle gate. And when Zedekiah saw them, and all the men of war, then they fled. But the Chaldeans pursued them, and overtook Zedekiah in the plains of Jericho. And the king of Babylon slew the sons of Zedekiah before his eyes. Moreover he put out Zedekiah's eyes, and bound him with chains, to carry him to Babylon. And the Chaldeans burned the king's house and the houses of the people with fire, and brake down the walls of Jerusalem. Then Nebuzar-adan, the captain of the guard, carried away captive into Babylon the remnant of the people that remained in the city, and those that fell away, that fell to him, with the rest of the people that remained. But Nebuzar-adan left the poor of the people which had nothing in the land of Judah, and gave them vineyards and fields at the same time."

"Now Nebuchadnezzar gave charge concerning Jeremiah, saying, Take him, and look well to him, and do him no harm; but do unto him even as he shall say unto

Jeremiah xxxix. 11.

thee. So the captain of the guard gave him victuals and a reward, and let him go."

Gedaliah, undoubtedly an Israelite, is appointed governor.

A moment's reflection must show us that Zedekiah was deserted by the eleven northern tribes of Israel, led by Jeremiah, and that the tribe of Judah, although under control, was in open revolt.

The whole twelve tribes of Israel, it is clear, shared in the bounties of Nebuchadnezzar after the fall of Jerusalem.

Now if the twelve tribes of Israel revolted to the Chaldeans, it stands to reason that they must have been under subjection to some power. And Zedekiah undoubtedly represented this power.

Zedekiah, therefore, could not have been their national king, or else they would have deposed him; and as Zedekiah was of the house of David, whose dynasty had ruled in Judea during some eight centuries, it becomes obvious that the Israelites were never in possession of their promised land.

"Then went Jeremiah unto Gedaliah; and dwelt with him among the people that

were left in the land. Likewise, when all the Jews that were in Moab and among the Ammonites and in Edom and that were in all countries heard that the king of Babylon had left a remnant in Judah, and that he had set over them Gedaliah, even all the Jews returned out of all places whither they were driven, and came to the land of Judah, to Gedaliah unto Mizpah, and gathered wine and summer fruits very much."

We must notice Mizpah is not in Judea, but in Israel. The Jews here undoubtedly refer to the Israelites. Is there not something mysterious lurking behind these records? It is clearly the object of the writers to lead us to suppose that the Jews were the people of the tribe of Judah, and that Zedekiah was their national king; how comes it then that they had been driven to seek a refuge in all countries, and directly their king has been mutilated, and the royal family have been murdered, and their holy city has been sacked, they flock into the country and gather summer fruits very much.

We must certainly infer they had escaped

from some overbearing thraldom; they certainly were not the Philistine Jews.

We do not seem to be able to gather from the narratives a very exact idea with whom Nebuchadnezzar was in conflict. It certainly could not have been with the Israelites under Jeremiah. It could not have been with the tribe of Judah, for they are clearly reaping the fruits of their enemies' defeat. Can there be a shadow of doubt that it was our old friends, the Cherethites, the Pelethites, and the Gittites of Gath, described in the Assyrian inscriptions as the Hittites, the children of Heth, the Philistine Hyksos, the Jews, who made "Judea their sanctuary, and Israel their dominion."

Truth will out, however adroitly it may be concealed.

Jeremiah himself admits us behind the scenes, and explains who Nebuchadnezzar was warring against, in no uncertain words: "The word of the Lord which came to Jeremiah, against Egypt, against the army of Pharaoh-Necho king of Egypt, which was by the River Euphrates in Carchemish,

Jeremiah xlvi. 1.

which Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon smote in the fourth year of Jehoakim the son of Josiah king of Judah."

This great battle of Carchemish is recorded on the Egyptian monuments; it was the last decisive trial of strength between Egypt and the northern powers. It was fought only a short time before the fall of Jerusalem. "The Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, saith: Behold, I will punish the multitude of No, and Pharaoh, and Egypt, with their gods and their kings, even Pharaoh and all them that trust in him; and I will deliver them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon." *Jeremiah xlvi. 25.*

So here Egypt is distinctly pointed out as one of the antagonists of Nebuchadnezzar: "The word of the Lord that came to Jeremiah against the Philistines. Thus saith the Lord: Behold waters rise up out of the north and shall overflow the land, and all that is therein; the city and them that dwell therein. Because of the day that cometh to spoil the Philistines, for the Lord will spoil the Philistines. Baldness has come upon Gaza, Ashkelon is cut off with the remnant of their valley." *Jeremiah xlvii.* *See also Isaiah xiv. 31.*

Here the Philistines, who have been adroitly obscured, are directly pointed out as the other antagonists of the Chaldean king; so it becomes evident that Nebuchadnezzer's attack on Jerusalem was against the Egyptians and Philistines.

Have we not here then a clear proof that the Philistines held Jerusalem, and that Zedekiah was the Philistine king? Can not we now extricate ourselves from the confusion resulting from the tribe of Judah being called Israelites and Jews.

The Philistines were supreme in Judea, but the Israelite tribe of Judah living in Judea were forced to submit; and we find them all through their history a disaffected class, and frequently in open rebellion.

People take their name from the country they possess. The Philistines possessed Judea, so they were called Jews. The Israelites living in Judea might also be called Jews.

Thus there are clearly two distinct races of Jews in Judæa, viz. the supreme Philistine Jews and the subjugated Israelite Jews. Hence all the confusion.

We must therefore understand that Zedekiah was the national king of the Philistine Jews, and king by conquest over the Israelite Jews.

We may further assure ourselves that it was the Philistine Jews who were taken into captivity on the fall of Jerusalem, and that it was the Israelite Jews, led by Jeremiah, who had fallen away to the Chaldeans, who were rewarded for their assistance, and on the defeat of the Philistines naturally flocked in from all places whither they had been driven, and gathered summer fruits very much. Having been banished to these places clearly shows that they were not the ruling power.

The whole design of priestcraft had but one aim, to make it appear that their God-protected people, the Hebrews, were in power in Palestine.

The authentic records have therefore been distorted to obscure the Philistine power, with the aim of leading us to infer the Hebrews were the Israelites, and to make us believe that it was the Israelites who were taken into captivity at the fall of

Jerusalem, and who on their return, regained their position in Palestine.

I must contend :—

1st. That the Philistines were supreme in Judea.

2nd. That the Hebrews were an insignificant community.

3rd. That the Israelites were expelled from the country by Ishmael and retreated to Egypt.

4th. That it was the Philistine Jews who were taken into captivity, and who, after the fall of the Chaldean power, returned, and under the name of Maccabees recovered some of their former importance.

CHAPTER XI.

I HAVE pointed out that Zedekiah, during his interview with Jeremiah, the leader of the Israelites, stated that he was afraid of the Jews. This undoubtedly refers to the Israelite Jews of the tribe of Judah. But we may, however, surmise that many of the Israelite Jews were loyal to Zedekiah, and that these would probably have shared in the captivity.

This would appear to be confirmed. "In the three and twentieth year of Nebuchadnezzar, Nebuzar-adan the captain of the guard, carried away captive of the Jews seven hundred forty and five persons. All the persons were four thousand and six hundred." *Jeremiah lii. 30.*

Does not this glaringly indicate that the captives included 745 Israelite Jews of the tribe of Judah, and 3,855 Philistine Jews. Again, we can point to the Chere-

thites, the Pelethites, and the Gittites of Gath being the ghostly power behind the house of David.

Let us now return to the Israelite Jews who have flocked into Israel [not Judea as recorded], and with their Israelite governor, Gedaliah, "are gathering their summer fruits very much:" "Now it came to pass in the seventh month that Ishmael, of the seed royal [of the house of David], came unto Gedaliah to Mizpah, and there they did eat bread. Then arose Ishmael and smote Gedaliah and slew him. Ishmael also slew all the Jews that were with him, and the Chaldeans that were found there and the men of war. Now the pit wherein Ishmael had cast all the dead bodies of the men was it which Asa the king had made for fear of Baasha king of Israel. Then Ishmael carried away captive all the residue of the people that were in Mizpah, and carried them away captive, and departed to go over to the Ammonites."

Jeremiah xli.

It will be noticed how craftily the Cherethites, the Pelethites, and the Gittites of Gath are being obscured.

It would be difficult to say who the Ammonites were, unless they refer to the followers of Amen-Ra; but as Ishmael is found in Gibeon, it is clear that he was retreating to the Philistine strongholds on the sea coast: "Then they took all the men and went to fight with Ishmael, and found him by the great waters that are in Gibeon," that is, on the sea coast. *Jeremiah xli. 12.*

We must judge from the result what occurred: "Then took Johanan the son of Kareah, and all the captains that were with him, and they departed, and dwelt in Chimham, which is by Bethlehem, to go to enter Egypt;" from which we may gather that Ishmael, now the Philistine chief, swept the Israelites out of Palestine, where they become lost to view.

Again it is recorded that Johanan [the Israelite captain of the forces] took all the remnant of Judah that were returned from all nations whither they had been driven, even men, and women, and children, and the king's daughters [clearly the daughters of Gedaliah], and every person that Nebuzar-adan had left with Gedaliah, and Jeremiah, *Jeremiah xliii. 5.*

and Baruch. So they came into the land of Egypt."

It becomes then glaringly apparent that all the Israelites, including the Jews of the tribe of Judah, were expelled from Palestine. Who then could have expelled them, but the Cherethite Philistines, under their leader Ishmael? Hence it follows that the Philistines were still dominant in Judea. They were not, however, the chosen people or the heirs to the Divine promise.

This difficulty is overcome by insensibly leading us to infer that the Philistines were the Israelites. The transformation scene is before us, the Philistine Jews fade from our view, and on their return from captivity, behold! they are Israelites.

Although I feel I have very feebly expressed myself, I must nevertheless submit I have given a solid ground for conjecturing that the Philistine Jews were the supreme power in Judea and Jerusalem; and although Jerusalem, one of their fortresses, was taken and sacked by the Chaldeans, yet they regained possession of it immediately the Chaldean forces retired. Undoubtedly these

Philistines were a section of the Egyptian power, and they continued to hold Judea until the conquest of the empire by the Persians; and the Hebrews and the Israelites are never heard of again, except perhaps as communities fused into the old Egyptian stock.

I must contend that the would-be captivity of the Israelites is a forged combination of priestcraft inserted in order to obscure the Philistines. It is glaringly apparent that the Israelites supported the Chaldeans during the siege of Jerusalem, and were rewarded for their assistance by Nebuchadnezzar; hence the captives taken away to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar could not have been the Israelites.

It is therefore a palpable distortion of history to lead us to suppose the captives that returned under Zerubbabel, a prince of the house of David, were Israelites.

The plot of the Biblical writers hinges upon this, for it was vital to their design that the Hebrews, the chosen people of the Almighty, should appear on the scene as possessors of their promised land.

See Wellhausen's History of Israel, and Professor Driver's Literature of the Old Testament.

It is now accepted by the highest authorities that the Biblical narratives have been compiled by many hands and many minds; and can we not easily detect that the Philistine records have been interwoven with those of the Israelites, and so distorted as to make it appear they all referred to Israelite history.

Jeremiah xli. 18.

The excuse given in the Biblical narratives why the Israelites under Jeremiah escaped to Egypt is singularly weak: "Because of the Chaldeans: for they were afraid of them, because Ishmael had slain Gedaliah whom the king of Babylon made governor in the land."

Baruch i. 11.

That the Israelites were brefriended by the Chaldeans is abundantly manifest. For Baruch, one of Jeremiah's priests, telis them to pray for the life of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, and for the life of Balthasar his son, that their days may be on the earth as the days of heaven.

This is not a prayer which would suggest itself to the people who had been taken into captivity, whose king had been mutilated, whose royal family had been massacred, and

whose royal city had been sacked. The Cherethites never offered up such a supplication for Nebuchadnezzar.

In case the reader should imagine that the Cherethites were annihilated at the fall of Jerusalem, I will again call attention to a prophecy written after this disaster, which clearly indicates that they were still a power in Judea, and that the name Cherethite embraces the whole Philistine nation: "Thus saith the Lord God; Because the Philistines have dealt by revenge; Therefore thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will stretch out mine hand upon the Philistines, and I will cut off the Cherethims, and destroy the remnants of the sea coasts. And I will execute great vengeance upon them with furious rebukes; and they shall know that I am the Lord." *Ezekiel xxv. 15.*

It is clear that the Philistines are still a dominating power, and they have been completely obscured in the Biblical narratives.

The fall of the house of David and the capture of their royal city, as we might suppose, indicated the fall of the Hyksos family in Egypt.

George Smith, Assyrian Eponym Canon, 203.

In 572 B.C. Nebuchadnezzar invades Egypt and probably placed the country under tribute.

The Chaldeans again are absolute masters of the entire empire.

As I have shown that the Israelites, and the Israelite Jews under Jeremiah, were rewarded by Nebuchadnezzar for their support during the siege of Jerusalem, the natural conclusion is that some other power conducted its defence. Although Zedekiah was king by conquest over the Israelite Jews, he was national king of the Cherethite or Philistine Jews. Thus between these two classes of Jews there must have existed a deadly animosity, which was exemplified in Ishmael's raid into Mizpah and his massacre of the Israelites. The Israelite Jews might pray for long life for Nebuchadnezzar and his son, but the Philistine Jews would shower on him their curses.

Jeremiah lii. 30.

It might have been true that on the fall of Jerusalem Nebuchadnezzar took away into captivity 745 Israelite Jews who had remained loyal to Zedekiah, and 3,845 of the Philistine Jews, yet we must remember

that during the invasions of the Assyrians vast numbers of Philistine Jews had been led away as captives.

During Sennacherib's expedition into Philistia he is recorded on his cylinder to have captured 200,150 people, so we may conclude that a large number of Philistine captives were spread over the Eastern Empire. These captives would be inspired with the bitterest hatred against the Israelites, and they would have held no communication with each other.

Assyrian Eponym Canon, George Smith, 134.

But, with unblushing effrontery, we find that these Philistine exiles in Babylon are paraded before us in such a manner as to lead us to infer they were Israelites !

I have shown that the house of David was at deadly feud with the Israelites through all their history, so the members of the royal house of David could have had no dealings with the Israelites. Perhaps priestcraft has secured a commanding position more through a claim of foresight than by any other method. A prophecy of some startling event carries with it a conviction of Divine inspiration.

See S. John iv. 9.

I need not point out how easily compilers of history could insert prophecies of events after they had occurred, and naturally no prediction which was not fulfilled would be inserted; but they sometimes admit us behind the scenes. As an example I will recall the would-be prophet Daniel. A prophecy of Isaiah clearly points him out as a prince of the house of David; Hezekiah is in trouble :

II. Kings xx. 16. "And Isaiah said unto Hezekiah, Behold the days come that all that is in thine house shall be carried into Babylon, and of *thy sons* that shall issue from thee they shall be *eunuchs* in the palace of the King of Babylon."

Daniel i. 3. Now, if the reader will turn to the book of Daniel, it will be noticed this prophecy was fulfilled to the letter; and we find Daniel, a prince of the house of David, occupying a position the most degrading it is possible for the western mind to realise ; and we must understand his misfortune had been brought upon him through the instrumentality of Jeremiah the Israelite. How bitter, then, must have been the hatred existing between Daniel and Jeremiah ; and

yet we find their two books bound together in our Bible, and we are taught to derive instruction and religious consolation from both.

Upon a prediction of this mythical Israelite Jeremiah, the Roman Church founded its power to depose with Bell and Book, King Henry VIII. of England.

This Bull of Pope Paul III. is so interesting I venture to give some short extracts from it, for which I am indebted to Mr. Collette.

"Sentence of Pope Paul III. against Henry VIII.

C. H. Collette, Queen Elizabeth and the Penal Laws, Appendix A, 169.

Condemnation and Excommunication of Henry VIII., King of England, and his Abettors and Accomplices, with the addition of other punishments.

Paul, Bishop, servant of the servants of God in perpetual remembrance of this matter.

We, although unworthy, the vice-gerent on earth of Him who, unchangeable and eternal, governs all things—and placed in the seat of justice—according also to the prediction of the Prophet Jeremiah in these words: 'Behold I have appointed thee

over nations and kingdoms, that thou mayest pull up and destroy, build and plant; the chief over all the kings of the universe, and all people sobtaining dominion.'" Wherefore, after mature deliberation upon these matters with our venerable brothers the Cardinals—require in the Lord that King Henry entirely abstain from the aforesaid errors, and revoke, declare void, and annul the aforesaid constitutions and laws, as in fact he made them, and that he entirely abstain from compelling his subjects to keep them; Otherwise, if King Henry and his abettors, adherents, advisers and followers shall not effectually obey the exhortations and requisitions of this kind, we excommunicate King Henry, his abettors, adherents, advisers and followers, by Apostolic authority, and pronounce that King Henry himself has incurred the penalty of deprivation of his kingdom and aforesaid dominions; and if in the meantime he shall die, we by our aforesaid authority and plenary power do declare and decree that he be deprived of ecclesiastical sepulture; and we strike them with the sword of anathema, maledic-

tion and eternal damnation. And we absolve and altogether set free from the aforesaid King or his accomplices, and from the oath of allegiance, vassalage, and all obedience to the King, and other the parties aforesaid, the magistrates, judges, constables, guardians, and officers of King Henry himself, and of his kingdom, and of all other his dominions. These nevertheless we command under penalty of excommunication, entirely to abstain from obeying the same King Henry and his officers. We by the same authority do will and decree, that King Henry and his accomplices be from that time infamous and not permitted to give evidence. We warn all the faithful in Christ to shun the aforesaid excommunicated, accursed, and condemned persons. Moreover we in like manner exhort and require the aforesaid princes, and all others even serving in the pay of the faithful in Christ, and other persons whomsoever, both by land and sea, who have men under arms, that they rise in arms against King Henry, his accomplices, and followers aforesaid, and that they persecute them, and every

of them, and force and compel them to return to the unity of the Church, and obedience of the aforesaid see.

Given at Rome at St. Mark in the year of our Lord 1535."

But what gave rise to no little surprise, King Henry retained the Papal revenues, which were the only veritable bones in contention.

The Times, March 12th, 1892.

"Fifty years ago most English readers believed that they knew all about the foundation and authorship of the Old Testament; they supposed that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, that Joshua recorded the conquest of Canaan, that Samuel composed Judges and Ruth, that David wrote all the Psalms, and that the prophets themselves committed their own prophecies to writing. It was a simple and satisfactory theory as long as it remained unquestioned; but it was one that would not bear a moment's serious examination."

When we find the highest authorities agree that neither Jeremiah nor any of the would-be prophets wrote the books ascribed to them, may we not conclude that the

narratives were only compiled, in their present form, to further the aims of priestcraft; and does not the bull of pope Paul III. indicate the power the priests acquired through them, and the motives which dictated them?

The reader will notice that there is nothing to surprise us in finding two races of people called Jews in Judea, that is the Philistine or Hyksos Jews, who conquered the country, and the subjugated Jews of the Israelite tribe of Judah.

A similar combination exists in our own history, for the Normans who conquered and occupied England soon became known as Englishmen.

Although the Jews, the Israelites, and the Hebrews, as well as the Normans and English, have since apparently become fused together in manners, customs, religion, and language, I must contend that at the time of the fall of Jerusalem under Nebuchadnezzar the Philistine Jews were then as distinctly a separate race from the Jews of the tribe of Judah as the Normans and the English were at the time of William the Conqueror.

Their laws and religion must have been based on different systems; they could not have had a common house of worship, and we may be morally certain that the Israelites were in no way associated with any Jewish temple.

At a much later date we have it recorded that the Jews had no dealings with the Samaritans; in these Samaritans we can recognise the Israelites, adroitly obscured under another name.

We learn that Cyrus, when he became ruler of the Eastern Empire, with the undoubted view of conciliating the Philistines, who were still dangerous factors in Judea, released these captives, and we are told some 50,000 returned under Zerubbabel, one of the princes of the house of David. It becomes manifest that these captives had no connection with Israelites.

Ezra ii. 2, 65.

I. Chron iii. 19.

And here we detect the subtlety of the Biblical writers in alluding to the Israelites of the tribe of Judah as Jews. For we are unhesitatingly led to understand that these prisoners who returned from captivity were Israelites.

Do not let us be deceived; these captives were the Cherethites, the Pelethites, and

the Gittites of Gath, the Philistine Hyksos prisoners, the true Jews. These Cherethites are not the chosen people of priestcraft, so they must be spirited away at all hazards; consequently, with bold effrontery, they are put upon the scene as the God-protected race, the Hebrews of the exodus.

It is evident that the Jews of the tribe of Judah were not taken into captivity by Nebuchadnezzar. Hence it becomes clear that the Jews who returned from captivity were not the Jews of the tribe of Judah. May we not then be absolutely certain that these Jews who returned from captivity were the Jews of Judea, known as the Cherethites or Philistines? here, then, we have the Hyksos before us face to face, still in possession of Judea, and it proves beyond a shadow of doubt that the Jews of Judea were the descendants of the Hyksos kings.

I anticipate my Jewish friends will give me the credit of endeavouring to place them in a better position in the world's esteem.

As we have lost sight of the Hebrews for

some little time, I will again exhibit them as indicated by Jeremiah.

Jerusalem was being besieged by the Babylonians, and very probably the slaves were showing signs of revolt. So Jeremiah applies to Zedekiah for their release and demands: "That every man should let his manservant, and every man his maidservant, being an Hebrew or an Hebrewess, go free."

Jeremiah xxxiv. 9.

It becomes manifest that the Hebrews were in a position of servitude, and could never have acquired any supremacy in Palestine.

I will now direct the reader's attention to a very curious side-light, palpably indicating that the Hebrews were not the Jews which the writers lead us to suppose, and also that they did not speak the same language.

I quote from the gospel of Nicodemus; which Gospel, by a favoured disciple of Jesus, was said to be accepted by the Apostles, but rejected afterwards as unauthentic. It is acknowledged as an audacious forgery.

The Suppressed Gospels and Epistles of the Original New Testament, by Archbishop Wake.

What volumes this opens to our view. Is

it possible to conceive, if we allow our reason to guide us, that a forgery could have been fabricated in the name of a personal friend of Jesus, and be accepted for a moment by the elders of the Church as genuine? Certainly it would have been detected at once as spurious; so we must conjecture it was a fraud originated by the priests.

Although the narratives are undoubtedly false, we can only presume that they were written by some one intimately acquainted with the Jews and the Hebrews.

Jesus is accused before Pilate for healing on the Sabbath day. Pilate sends a Greek messenger to call Jesus before him. The messenger returns and tells Pilate as follows: "When thou sentest me from Jerusalem to Alexander I saw Jesus sitting in a mean figure upon a she ass, and the children of the Hebrews cried out Hosannah, holding boughs of trees in their hands. Others spread their garments in the way and said, Save us, thou who art in Heaven; blessed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord. Then the Jews cried out against the

Gospel of Nicodemus i. 12.

messenger and said, The children of the Hebrews made their acclamations in the *Hebrew language*, and how couldst thou, who art a Greek, understand the *Hebrew?* The messenger answered them and said, I asked one of the *Jews* and said, What is this which the children do cry out in the Hebrew language? And he explained it to me, saying, They cry out Hosannah, which being interpreted is, O Lord, save me; or, O Lord, save."

See Nehemiah, xiii. 24.

May we not gather from this that the Hebrews were a class distinct from the Jews, and spoke a different language? and if they are a distinct class here they have been so all through their history.

We might conjecture that the Gospel of Nicodemus was compiled to lead us to infer Jesus was a Hebrew. If we credit the narratives he is distinctly associated with the Hebrews; but if we would know who Jesus was we must turn to the Koran, and there we shall find Isa, the son of Mariam, a great mahdi and prophet of Allah.

The Rev. E. Garbett, M.A., "select

preacher and Boyle lecturer," in a sermon preached before the University of Oxford, November 16, 1862, writes as follows :—

"If the belief in the infallibility of the Scriptures be a falsehood, the Church founded upon it must be a living fraud . . . in all consistent reason we must accept the whole of the inspired autographs or reject the whole as from beginning to end unauthoritative and worthless."

I must submit that the Rev. E. Garbett is sternly logical, for it follows if the Biblical narratives are not inspired by the Almighty they are forgeries.

M. Renan is reported to have stated: "It is better to have some kind of faith than to believe in nothing at all. To me religion is the indispensable necessity which alone satisfies the craving for the ideal in human nature in all latitudes ; and what religion could better satisfy ideal aspirations than does the Catholic, with its mystic poetry and the imposing, well-balanced pomp of its ceremonials ?"

The Times, April 22nd, 1892.

Such a conception would apply to every religion, and recalls the trite old saying,

"Where ignorance is bliss 'tis folly to be wise."

The question, however, naturally arises, can we derive benefit from delusions, and are we tamely to sanction a class fattening upon them?

I will leave my readers to form their own conclusions.

II. Kings xxii. 8. We have it recorded that the priest Hilkiah found the lost book of the law, which revealed the precepts of the Almighty.

Is it not high time to search for another such volume?

It will not be discovered by priest or pope.

It will not be found in any ecclesiastical library.

It will be entitled Philosophy and Science.

Will students and scholars endeavour to find it?

I will conclude in the name of the Great Philistine god, Amen, still potential in its distorted form,

AMEN.

NICHOLS & SONS, PRINTERS, 25, PARLIAMENT STREET, WESTMINSTER.

School of Theology

DS
121
K35

[Kennard, H Martyn]
Philistines and Hebrews; an essay on the Biblical narratives, by a Philistine. London, Chapman & Hall, 1892.
xii, 158p. 22cm.

"For private circulation."
Includes bibliographical references.

1. Jews--Hist.--To 586 B.C. 2. Philistines. I. Title.

CCSC/ef

A11075